arXiv:1403.6313v1 [math.AP] 25 Mar 2014

EXISTENCE AND REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS TO OPTIMAL PARTITION PROBLEMS INVOLVING LAPLACIAN EIGENVALUES

MIGUEL RAMOS, HUGO TAVARES, AND SUSANNA TERRACINI

Abstract. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open bounded domain and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Given $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider a wide class of optimal partition problems involving Dirichlet eigenvalues of elliptic operators, including the following

$$\inf \left\{ \Phi(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_{k_i}(\omega_i) : \ (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega) \right\},$$

where $\lambda_{k_i}(\omega_i)$ denotes the k_i–th eigenvalue of $(-\Delta, H_0^1(\omega_i))$ counting multiplicities, and $\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$ is the set of all open partitions of Ω, namely

$$\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega) = \{(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) : \ \omega_i \subset \Omega \text{ open}, \ \omega_i \cap \omega_j = \emptyset \ \forall i \neq j\}.$$

We prove the existence of an open optimal partition $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$, proving as well its regularity in the sense that the free boundary $\cup_{i=1}^m \partial\omega_i \cap \Omega$ is, up to a residual set, locally a $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurface.

In order to prove this result, we first treat some general optimal partition problems involving all eigenvalues up to a certain order. This class of problems includes the one with cost function $\Phi_p(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) := \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (\lambda_j(\omega_i))^p \right)^{1/p}$, whose solutions approach the solutions of the original problem as $p \to +\infty$. The study of this new class of problems is done via a singular perturbation approach with a class of Schrödinger-type systems which models competition between different groups of possibly sign-changing components. An optimal partition appears in relation with the nodal set of the limiting components, as the competition parameter becomes large. The proofs also involve new boundary Harnack principles on NTA and Reifenberg flat domains, as well as an extensive use of Almgren–type monotonicity formulas.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. A general existence result. An approximated problem depending on p 9
2.1. Preliminaries 9
2.2. Uniform bounds in Hölder spaces. Proof of the general existence theorem 15
2.3. Almgren's Monotonicity Formula 22
3. Regularity of the nodal set of the approximated solution 30
3.1. Compactness of blowup sequences 31

Date: March 26, 2014.

Key words and phrases. elliptic competitive systems, optimal partition problems, Laplacian eigenvalues, segregation phenomena, extremality conditions, regularity theory on NTA and Reifenberg flat domains, regularity of free boundary problems, blowup techniques, Almgren's Monotonicity Formula, Boundary Harnack Principle.

Acknowledgments. H. Tavares was supported by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia through the program Investigador FCT. H. Tavares and S. Terracini are partially supported through the project ERC Advanced Grant 2013 n. 339958 "Complex Patterns for Strongly Interacting Dynamical Systems - COMPAT".

3.2. Hausdorff dimension estimates for the nodal and singular sets. Definition of $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, the regular part of the nodal set 38
3.3. A Clean-Up result. $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is locally flat 41
3.4. The set $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is locally a regular hypersurface 47
4. The limit of the approximating solutions as $p \to \infty$. Existence and regularity results for the initial problem 54
4.1. Properties of the approximating solutions u_p, v_p. Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5 54
4.2. Proof of property (H1): Strong convergence of the last components of u_p, v_p 57
4.3. Proof of properties (H2) and (H3): Regularity of the last components of $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$, and of the partition $(\widetilde{\omega}_1, \widetilde{\omega}_2)$ 60
Appendix A. Boundary behavior on NTA and Reifenberg flat domains 63
A.1. Results on NTA domains 63
A.2. Results on Reifenberg flat domains 64
References 70

1. Introduction

Let Ω be an open bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geqslant 2$) and take $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{N}$. The starting point and first aim of this paper is to prove existence and regularity of solutions to problems of type:

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_m)\in\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_{k_i}(\omega_i), \tag{1.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega) = \{(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) \subseteq \Omega^m : \ \omega_i \text{ open } \forall i, \ \omega_i \cap \omega_j = \emptyset \ \forall i \neq j\}$$

denotes the class of all partitions of Ω with m open sets, and $\lambda_k(\omega)$ is the k–th eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ in $H^1_0(\omega)$, counting multiplicities. Observe that (1.1) is an example of an optimal partition problem (see for instance [6, Section 5.5] or [7]) with cost function $\Phi(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) := \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{k_i}(\omega_i)$, and class of admissible sets given by $\mathcal{A}(\Omega) := \{\omega \subseteq \Omega : \ \omega \text{ open set}\}$.

Optimal partition problems belong to the wide family of shape optimization problems, and have many applications in physics and engineering. They also play a fundamental role in the study of the nodal sets of eigenfunctions of Schrödinger operators [21], as well as in the proof of monotonicity formulas [1, 3, 4, 20, 22, 23, 30, 33]. In general, these kind of problems may only have solution in a relaxed sense [8, 9], except when one imposes certain geometric constraints on the admissible domains, or some monotonicity properties on the cost function (we refer the reader to the book by Bucur and Buttazzo [6] for a good survey on these issues). Problem (1.1) falls into the second case: as Φ is monotone decreasing with respect to set inclusion, as well as lower semi continuous for the γ–convergence, the general abstract result of [7] implies the existence of solution for (1.1) in the class of *quasi-open sets*. In general, it is hard to pass from quasi-open to open sets. By using a penalization technique with partition of unity functions, Bourdin, Bucur and Oudet [5] give a different proof for the existence of quasi-open solutions, while proving the existence of open solutions for the bidimensional case $N = 2$ (by using a compactness result by Šverák [31] which only holds in dimension two). Much more is known for $k_1 = \ldots = k_m = 1$ or, more generally, when $1 \leqslant k_i \leqslant 2$ for all i, but we will leave the discussion of these particular cases for later.

In this paper we are concerned not only with existence results in the class of open sets, but also with the regularity of the optimal partition, or, more specifically, of the common boundaries of the elements of the partition itself. Let us state rigorously what we intend by regularity.

Definition 1.1. An open partition $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$ is called *regular* if:

1. denoting $\Gamma = \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m \omega_i$, there holds[1] $\mathscr{H}_{\dim}(\Gamma) \leqslant N-1$;
2. there exists a set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \Gamma$, relatively open in Γ, such that
   - $\mathscr{H}_{\dim}(\Gamma \setminus \mathcal{R}) \leqslant N-2$;
   - $\mathcal{R}$ is a collection of hypersurfaces of class $C^{1,\alpha}$ (for some $0 < \alpha < 1$), each one separating two different elements of the partition.

Moreover we ask that, if $N = 2$, then actually $\Gamma \setminus \mathcal{R}$ is a locally finite set, and that $\mathcal{R}$ consists of a locally finite collection of curves meeting at singular points with equal angles.

Remark 1.2. In particular, observe that a regular partition exhausts the whole domain, as it satisfies $\overline{\Omega} = \cup_{i=1}^m \overline{\omega_i}$.

A key point in the proof of the regularity will be to derive proper extremality conditions on Γ for the eigenfunctions associated with the optimal partition. Observe that for (1.1) this fact is difficult and not obvious at all, as no domain variation formula is available in the unfortunate (yet possible) case of degenerate eigenvalues (observe that we will take any prescribed $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{N}$). This fact, together with the initial lack of regularity of the interfaces, makes Hadamard type conditions unavailable for this problem.

Our first main result deals with existence and regularity of solutions to a wide class of optimal partition problems which includes (1.1), providing as well regularity and extremality conditions for the corresponding eigenfunctions. Take a function $F : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

(F1) $F \in C^1((\mathbb{R}^+)^m)$, and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} > 0$ in $(\mathbb{R}^+)^m$ for every $i = 1, \dots, m$;

(F2) Given i, and for every fixed $\bar{x}_j > 0$, $j \neq i$, we have

$$F(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{i-1}, x_i, \bar{x}_{i+1} \dots, \bar{x}_m) \to +\infty \qquad \text{as } x_i \to +\infty.$$

Consider

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_m)\in\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)} F(\lambda_{k_1}(\omega_1), \dots, \lambda_{k_m}(\omega_m)). \tag{1.2}$$

Theorem 1.3. *The optimal partition problem* (1.2) *admits a regular solution* $(\widetilde{\omega}_1, \dots, \widetilde{\omega}_m) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$.

Moreover, let $(\tilde{u}_n^i)_n$ *be the sequence of eigenfunction of* $\widetilde{\omega}_i$*, ordered according to the increasing sequence of eigenvalues. Then for each* $i = 1, \dots, m$ *there exists* $1 \leqslant l_i \leqslant k_i$ *such that*

$$\tilde{u}_{l_i}^i, \tilde{u}_{l_i+1}^i, \dots, \tilde{u}_{k_i}^i \qquad \text{are Lipschitz continuous,}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\omega}_i = \operatorname{int}\left(\overline{\left\{\sum_{j=l_i}^{k_i} (\tilde{u}_j^i)^2 > 0\right\}}\right).$$

Finally, on the regular part of the common boundary, we have the following extremality condition: for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ *there exist coefficients* $\tilde{a}_{l_i}^i, \dots, \tilde{a}_{k_i}^i > 0$ *such that*

[1] Here, $\mathscr{H}_{\dim}(\cdot)$ denotes the Hausdorff dimension of a set.

given $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}$, denoting by $\widetilde{\omega}_i$ and $\widetilde{\omega}_j$ the two adjacent sets of the partition at x_0,

$$\lim_{\substack{x\to x_0\\ x\in\widetilde{\omega}_i}} \sum_{n=l_i}^{k_i} \tilde{a}_n^i |\nabla \tilde{u}_n^i(x)|^2 = \lim_{\substack{x\to x_0\\ x\in\widetilde{\omega}_j}} \sum_{n=l_j}^{k_j} \tilde{a}_n^j |\nabla \tilde{u}_n^j(x)|^2 \neq 0.$$

Remark 1.4. Both in this theorem and in the following main results, the regularity of the free boundary can be extended up to the boundary $\partial\Omega$ under appropriate regularity assumptions on the set Ω. We refer the reader to [33, Section 7] for the details.

The coefficients a_n^i appear as the result of a double penalization/approximation of the problem. To simplify the presentation, we deal from now on with $F(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i$, hence with (1.1) - the general case follows exactly in the same way, as the proofs only use properties (F1) and (F2); check also Remark 4.2 ahead. In order to motivate our approach, let us review first the cases $k_i = 1$, or $k_i = 2$ for every i.

The study of (1.1) in the case $k_1 = \ldots = k_m = 1$ is the simplest, as it can be characterized by an absolute minimization of an energy functional in a singular space, namely

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \int_\Omega |\nabla u_i|^2 \, dx : \ u_i \in H_0^1(\Omega), \ \int_\Omega u_i^2 \, dx = 1, \ u_i \cdot u_j \equiv 0 \ \forall i \neq j \right\}. \tag{1.3}$$

This minimization problem was the main object of study in [11, 16], where it is proved the existence of a positive Lipschitz continuous solution $(u_1, \dots, u_m)$ to (1.3), and that the partition $(\{u_1 > 0\}, \dots, \{u_m > 0\})$ is a regular element of $P_m(\Omega)$, achieving $\inf_{\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_1(\omega_i)$. The existence result was first proved in [16] together with the regularity for $N = 2$. The regularity result in any space dimension was then stated in [11], see also [33, Section 8] for a detailed proof. We would like to stress that the proofs in these papers cannot be applied to the case of higher eigenvalues. We also refer to the papers [14, 15], where related optimal partition problems involving sums of first nonlinear eigenvalues are considered.

Another natural approach to the problem is to consider limiting profiles of solutions to the singularly perturbed problem

$$-\Delta u_i = \lambda_i u_i - \beta \sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq i}}^m u_i u_j^2, \quad u_i \in H_0^1(\Omega), \qquad i = 1, \dots, m, \tag{1.4}$$

under the constraints

$$\int_\Omega u_i^2 \, dx = 1, \qquad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Theses systems have been the object of an intensive study in the last decade, in particular in the case of competitive interaction $\beta > 0$, mainly because of its interesting mathematical features, as well as for its physical applications (for instance in the study of Bose-Einstein condensation). Their relation with optimal partition problems has also been addressed, for instance in [2, 11, 13, 16, 21, 34]. It has been shown in [29, 34] that, in some situations, phase separation occurs between different components as the competition parameter increases, i.e., $\beta \to \infty$. In particular it is shown that by taking an L^∞ bounded family of solution $(u_\beta)_\beta$, and corresponding bounded coefficients $(\lambda_{i\beta})_\beta$, then there exists a limiting profile $u_i := \lim_{\beta\to+\infty} u_{i\beta}$ such that $(\{u_1 \neq 0\}, \dots, \{u_m \neq 0\}) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$, and

$$-\Delta \tilde{u}_i = \lambda_i \tilde{u}_i \qquad \text{in } \{u_i \neq 0\}.$$

This clearly illustrates the relation between optimal partitions involving eigenvalues and the system of Schrödinger equations (1.4). In particular, it is known that (1.3) can be well approximated (as $\beta \to \infty$) by the ground state (least energy) levels of (1.4), namely:

$$\inf\left\{\int_\Omega \sum_{i=1}^m |\nabla u_i|^2 + \beta \sum_{i<j} u_i^2 u_j^2 :\ u_i \in H_0^1(\Omega) \text{ and } \int_\Omega u_i^2\,dx = 1\right\}.$$

Thus, using this approach and the results in [33], one proves once again the existence of a regular partition to the problem of summing first eigenvalues. However, passing to higher eigenvalues is not an easy task, as one needs to construct suitable minimax characterizations at higher energy levels of (1.4). Indeed in [34], by using a new notion of vector genus, several sign changing solutions are build for (1.4), and by taking the least energy sign-changing solution among these, one approaches the second eigenfunctions associated to the optimal partition problem $\inf_{\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)} \lambda_2(\omega_i)$. By putting together the previous results, one then can actually solve (1.1) for $1 \leqslant k_i \leqslant 2$. In order to solve the general problem with higher eigenvalues, however, it does not seem completely clear to us which variational characterization for solutions of (1.4) one could take (see [34, Subsection 4.1] for a conjecture). Thus here we decided to follow a different strategy relying on a double approximation procedure, which we will describe next. The relevant and surprising fact is that instead of taking minimax levels for a certain energy functional, we are able to solve the problem for every $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ through a symmetric constrained energy minimization.

In order to cope with the problem of not knowing a priori what is the multiplicity of each set of the optimal partition, our motivation was to try to find approximate solutions of (1.1) through the minimization process of a certain energy functional. Partially inspired by [21] (where a different problem is treated), we let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the problem

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_m)\in\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^m \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (\lambda_j(\omega_i))^p\Big)^{1/p}. \tag{1.5}$$

Observe that (1.5) is a good approximation for (1.1) for large p, as, given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any positive real numbers $a_1, \dots, a_k$, there holds $(a_1^p + \dots + a_k^p)^{1/p} \to \max\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ as $p \to \infty$. Thus, for any given partition $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \lambda_j(\omega_i)^p\Big)^{1/p} \to \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{k_i}(\omega_i) \qquad \text{as } p \to +\infty.$$

We will prove that an optimal solution $(\omega_{1p}, \dots, \omega_{mp})$ of (1.5) exists and approaches, as $p \to \infty$, a solution of our original problem (1.1). More precisely, our second main result is the following.

Theorem 1.5. *Given $p \in \mathbb{N}$, the optimal partition problem* (1.5) *admits a regular solution $(\omega_{1p}, \dots, \omega_{mp}) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$.*

Moreover, under the previous notations, let $(u^i_{np})_n$ be the sequence of eigenfunction of ω_{ip}, ordered according to the increasing sequence of eigenvalues. Then for every $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$u^i_{1p}, \dots, u^i_{k_i p} \qquad \textit{are Lipschitz continuous}$$

and

$$\omega_{ip} = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (u^i_{jp})^2 > 0 \right\} = \operatorname{int}\left(\overline{\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (u^i_{jp})^2 > 0 \right\}} \right).$$

On the regular part of the common boundary, we have the following extremality condition: for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ there exist coefficients $a^i_{1p}, \dots, a^i_{k_i p} > 0$ such that

> *given $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}$, denoting by ω_{ip} and ω_{jp} the two adjacent sets of the partition at x_0,*
>
> $$\lim_{\substack{x \to x_0 \\ x \in \omega_{ip}}} \sum_{n=1}^{k_i} a^i_{np} |\nabla u^i_{np}(x)|^2 = \lim_{\substack{x \to x_0 \\ x \in \omega_{jp}}} \sum_{n=1}^{k_j} a^j_{np} |\nabla u^j_{np}(x)|^2 \neq 0$$

Finally, as $p \to +\infty$,

$$a^i_{np} \to 0 \ \forall n = 1, \dots, l_i - 1, \qquad a^i_{np} \to \tilde{a}^i_n \ \forall n = l_i, \dots, k_i,$$

and we have strong convergence of the last $k_i - l_i + 1$ eigenfunctions:

$$u^i_{np} \to \tilde{u}^i_n \text{ strongly in } H^1_0(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}), \qquad \forall 0 < \gamma < 1, \ \forall n = l_i, \dots, k_i$$

(where $\tilde{a}^i_n$ and $\tilde{u}^i_n$ are the coefficients and functions appearing in Theorem 1.3.

The existence and regularity results of the previous theorem will come out as a particular case of a more general result, for optimal partition problems that depend on all eigenvalues up to a certain order. More precisely, take $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a function $\psi : (\mathbb{R}^+_0)^k \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (F1), (F2), that is

- $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_i}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) > 0$ for every i, whenever $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k > 0$;
- Given i, and for every fixed $\bar{\xi}_j > 0$, $j \neq i$, we have

$$\psi(\bar{\xi}_1, \dots, \bar{\xi}_{i-1}, \xi_i, \bar{\xi}_{i+1} \dots, \bar{\xi}_m) \to +\infty \qquad \text{as } \xi_i \to +\infty.$$

Now, given m functions $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m$ satisfying these assumptions (eventually for different $k_1, \dots, k_m$), we will consider the following class of optimal partition problems

$$\inf_{(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \psi_i(\lambda_1(\omega_i), \dots, , \lambda_{k_i}(\omega_i)), \tag{1.6}$$

As examples we have (1.5), the optimization with cost function $\sum_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} \lambda_j(\omega_i)$, or any combination of the two, among many other.

We will prove that (1.6) can be reformulated as a constrained minimization problem of an energy functional:

(1.7)

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{m} \psi_i \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u^i_1|^2 \, dx, \dots, \int_\Omega |\nabla u^i_{k_i}|^2 \, dx \right) : \begin{array}{r} u^i \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{k_i}), \ u^i_k \cdot u^j_l \equiv 0 \ \forall k, l, i \neq j \\ \text{and, for every } i, \ \displaystyle\int_\Omega u^i_k u^i_l \, dx = \delta_{kl} \ \forall k, l \\ \displaystyle\int_\Omega \nabla u^i_k \cdot \nabla u^i_l \, dx = 0 \ \forall k \neq l \end{array} \right\}$$

and that this, in turn, can be approximated by a solution to a competitive system of $k_1 + \dots + k_m$ equations, where competition occurs between groups of components. More precisely,

take the penalized energy functional $E_\beta : \mathbb{R}^{k_1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{R}^{k_m}$ defined as

$$E_\beta(u^1,\ldots,u^m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \psi_i\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_1^i|^2\,dx,\ldots,\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{k_i}^i|^2\,dx\right) + \sum_{i<j}\frac{2\delta_{ij}\beta}{q}\int_\Omega \left((u_1^i)^2+\ldots+(u_{k_i}^i)^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}\left((u_1^j)^2+\ldots+(u_{k_j}^j)^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}\,dx$$

where $2 < 2q < 2^*$, and consider the energy level

$$c_\beta := \inf\left\{ E_\beta(u^1,\ldots,u^m) : \begin{array}{c} u^i = (u_1^i,\ldots,u_{k_i}^i) \in H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{k_i}) \\ \text{and, for every } i,\ \displaystyle\int_\Omega u_k^i u_l^i\,dx = \delta_{kl}\ \forall k,l, \\ \displaystyle\int_\Omega \nabla u_k^i\cdot\nabla u_l^i\,dx = 0\ \forall k\neq l \end{array} \right\}. \tag{1.8}$$

Our third and last main result reads as follows.

Theorem 1.6. *Under the previous notations, the following holds.*

(i) *There exists $(u_\beta^1,\ldots,u_\beta^m)$ achieving c_β. Moreover, for some $\mu_{jl,\beta}^i > 0$, $i = 1,\ldots,m$, $j,l = 1,\ldots,k_i$, it is a solution of the system*

$$-a_{l,\beta}^i\Delta u_l^i = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i}\mu_{jl}^i u_l^i - \beta u_l^i\Big((u_1^i)^2+\ldots+(u_{k_i}^i)^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq i}}^m\Big((u_1^j)^2+\ldots+(u_{k_j}^j)^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}}, \tag{1.9}$$

with

$$a_{l,\beta}^i = \frac{\partial\psi_i}{\partial\xi_l}\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{1,\beta}^i|^2\,dx,\ldots,\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{k_i,\beta}^i|^2\,dx\right) > 0.$$

(ii) *There exists $(\bar u^1,\ldots,\bar u^m)$, with Lipschitz continuous components, such that*

$$u_\beta^i \to \bar u^i \qquad \text{strongly in } H_0^1\cap C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{R}^{k_i})\ \forall 0<\gamma<1, \qquad \text{as } \beta\to\infty;$$

and

$$-a_l^i\Delta u_l^i = \mu_l^i\bar u_l^i \qquad \text{in } \left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k_i}(\bar u_j^i)^2 > 0\right\} = \operatorname{int}\left(\overline{\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k_i}(\bar u_j^i)^2>0\right\}}\right). \tag{1.10}$$

for $a_l^i = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} a_{l,\beta}^i > 0$ and $\mu_l^i = \lim_{\beta\to\infty}\mu_{ll,\beta}^i > 0$.

(iii) *The vector $(\bar u^1,\ldots,\bar u^m)$ achieves (1.7), and such level is the limit of c_β as $\beta\to\infty$;*

(iv) *The partition*

$$(\bar\omega_1,\ldots,\bar\omega_m) := \left(\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k_1}(\bar u_j^1)^2>0\right\},\ldots,\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{k_m}(\bar u_j^m)^2>0\right\}\right)\in\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$$

is regular, and solves the optimal partition problem (1.5).

(v) *For $a_l^i = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} a_{l\beta}^i$, we have that, whenever x_0 belongs to the regular part of the common nodal set of $(\bar u^1,\ldots,\bar u^m)$, if $\bar\omega_i,\bar\omega_j$ are the corresponding adjacent sets, then*

$$\lim_{\substack{x\to x_0\\ x\in\bar\omega_i}}\sum_{n=1}^{k_i} a_n^i|\nabla u_n^i(x)|^2 = \lim_{\substack{x\to x_0\\ x\in\bar\omega_j}}\sum_{n=1}^{k_j} a_n^j|\nabla u_n^j(x)|^2 \neq 0 \tag{1.11}$$

Observe that the existence of minimizers in (1.7) and (1.8) is not a trivial fact (unlike in (1.3)) due to restriction on the gradients $\int_\Omega \nabla u_k^i \cdot \nabla u_l^i \, dx = 0$, $k \neq l$. We will be able to remove this condition by extending the ψ_i's to symmetri functions defined on the space of self-adjoint matrices. The coefficients a_l^i, which give the extremality conditions, are related to the chosen functions ψ_i, thus are related to the penalization. We recall that for the choice

$$\psi_{ip} : (\mathbb{R}_0^+)^{k_i} \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad \psi_{i,p}(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k_i}) := \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \xi_j^p \right)^{1/p}$$

we are dealing with (1.5) and thus, with an approximation of (1.1). It turns out that the coefficients in the extremality condition of Theorem 1.3 come out from the double approximation as being a limit as $\beta \to +\infty$, followed from a limit as $p \to +\infty$, of the coefficients provided in the previous theorem.

The asymptotic study of systems of type (1.9), that is, competitive systems which lead to phase segregation between groups of components, was done by Caffarelli Lin [12] in a simpler situation. There, all components are taken to be nonnegative, $\mu_{jl}^i = 0$, and the problem corresponds to the minimization of an associated free energy. The fact that our components may change sign, as well as the fact that at the limit we get an eigenvalue problem (1.10) with (possibly) different parameters, instead of an harmonic equation, makes the study of the free boundary much more delicate. In particular, we will prove an Harnack Boundary Principle for quotients of two components of each vector u^i which is not contained in the celebrated paper by Jerison and Kenig [25]. Moreover, our proof of Theorem 1.6 will make it clear that the its conclusions (i)-(ii)-(iii) also hold for any

$$(u_\beta^1, \dots, u_\beta^m) \qquad L^\infty\text{–bounded solution,}$$

with

$$0 < A \leqslant a_{l,\beta}^i \leqslant B, \qquad |\mu_{jl,\beta}^i| \leqslant C.$$

The minimality of the energy is only used explicitly in Proposition 2.13 ahead, which only provides a more precise understanding of the optimal partition, and it is not necessary in order to obtain the convergence and regularity results stated in (i)-(ii)-(iii).

Finally, let us now come to other possible applications of our strategy and future directions of research. Recall that in [21] spectral minimal partitions like

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_m)\in P_m(\Omega)} \max_{i=1,\dots,m} \{\lambda_1(\omega_i)\} \tag{1.12}$$

were introduced (see the survey [20] for a description on the subject). Our approach can be applied to the following generalization of (1.12)

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_m)\in P_m(\Omega)} \max_{i=1,\dots,m} \{\lambda_{k_i}(\omega_i)\}, \qquad \text{for } k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{N},$$

(which is not contained in the assumptions of Theorem 1.3) by taking the following approximating problem (for p and q large):

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_m)\in P_m(\Omega)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (\lambda_j(\omega_i))^q \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p}.$$

This, in turn, can also be well approximated by constrained minimal energy solutions of a competitive Schrödinger system.

Another interesting question, that we wish to tackle in the near future, is to check if, in (1.1), *every* optimal partition has a regular *representative* (in the sense of a class of equivalence involving the capacity of sets). This was proved in [21] for (1.12), and it is our belief that the strategy followed there can be sucessfully combined with our approach for (1.1).

The paper is organized as follows.

- We start to deal with the general problem (1.6). In Section 2 we prove existence of an open partition for it, introducing system (1.9) and the minimization problem c_β (Subsections 2.1), proving afterwards uniform Hölder bounds for the solutions of the system, as well as qualitative properties for the limiting configuration such as phase separation and Lispchitz regularity. The proof that $(\bar\omega_1, \dots, \bar\omega_m) \in \mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)$ solves (1.6) is concluded in Subsection 2.2, while in Subsection 2.3 we give another characterization of the optimal sets, and check the validity of an Almgren's monotonicity formula.
- Almgren's formula will be the key to Section 3, where we end the proof of Theorem 1.6 proving that the optimal partition is regular. Here, although with different proofs, we follow the structure of [12, 33], using the Almgren's quotient to characterize the regular and singular part of the free boundary (Subsection 3.2) after a careful study of blowup sequences (Subsection 3.1), and then in the last two sections we first shown the extremality condition (1.11) and construct explicitly the normal vector to the surface, which then leads to a non degeneracy property.
- As already said, Theorem 1.6 yields in particular existence and regularity of an optimal partition for (1.5), giving also some properties for the associated eigenfunctions: Theorem 1.5. Section 4 is then dedicated to the study of the limit $p \to \infty$, which yields our first main result, Theorem 1.3.
- Finally in Appendix A we prove generalizations of some of the results of [25], namely Boundary Harnack Principles for the quotient between two functions satisfying two different problems, with one of the functions being possibly sign-changing.

Remark 1.7. To simplify the notation, we will present the proofs of the theorems for the simpler case $k_1 = \dots, k_m =: k$, and deal with partitions with $m = 2$ components. It will become clear that the general case follows exactly in the same way, without any extra work.

Notation. We will denote the H^1_0–norm simply the $\|\cdot\|$, namely $\|u\|^2 := \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2\, dx$.

2. A general existence result. An approximated problem depending on p

2.1. **Preliminaries.** As previously mentioned, to simplify the presentation we will work from now on with $m = 2$ and $k_1 = k_2 =: k \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $\mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{O}_k(\mathbb{R})$ as the spaces of symmetric and orthogonal $k \times k$ matrices with real entries, respectively. In order to deal with (1.5) and (1.6), we will work with a special class of functions with domain in $\mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R})$.

Definition 2.1. We say that $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$ if $\varphi : \mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ is C^1 in $\mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R}) \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$\varphi(M) = \varphi(P^T M P) \qquad \text{for all } M \in \mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } P \in \mathcal{O}_k(\mathbb{R}).$$

Moreover, consider the restriction ψ of φ to the space of diagonal matrices, that is $\psi(a_1, \dots, a_k) := \varphi(\mathrm{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_k))$. Then we ask that

- $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a_i} > 0$ on $(\mathbb{R}^+)^k$ for every $i = 1, \dots, k$;

- for each i and $\bar a_1,\dots,\bar a_{i-1},\bar a_{i+1},\dots,\bar a_k>0$, we have

$$\psi(\bar a_1,\dots,\bar a_{i-1},a_i,\bar a_{i+1},\dots,\bar a_k)\to+\infty \quad \text{as } a_i\to+\infty.$$

Remark 2.2. Along this paper, whenever we say that $\varphi:\mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R})\to\mathbb{R}$ is a C^1 function, we are identifying $\mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R})$ with $\mathbb{R}^{k(k+1)/2}$. The partial derivative $\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\xi_{ij}}$ with $i\geqslant j$ denotes the derivative of φ along the direction of the symmetric matrix A having all entries zero except for $a_{ij}=a_{ji}=1$.

Examples. Functions as in Definition 2.1 just depend on the set of the eigenvalues of a matrix. To fix our mind, let us think of the examples $\varphi(M)=(\mathrm{trace}(M^p))^{1/p}$ for $p\in\mathbb{N}$, or $\varphi(M)=\det(M)$. In these cases, $\psi(a_1,\dots,a_k)=\left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^p\right)^{1/p}$ and $\psi(a_1,\dots,a_k)=\prod_{i=1}^k a_i$, respectively. We will use the first of these examples to treat (1.5).

The main aim of this section is to prove the following result.

Theorem 2.3. *Given $\varphi\in\mathcal{F}$, the level*

$$\begin{aligned} c_\infty :&= \inf_{(\omega_1,\omega_2)\in\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)}\sum_{i=1}^2\varphi\left(\mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1(\omega_i),\dots,\lambda_k(\omega_i))\right)\\ &= \inf_{(\omega_1,\omega_2)\in\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)}\sum_{i=1}^2\psi(\lambda_1(\omega_i),\dots,\lambda_k(\omega_i)) \end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

is achieved.

Corollary 2.4. *In particular, going through the previous examples, we have that the optimal partition problems*

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\omega_2)\in\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)}\sum_{i=1}^2\left(\sum_{j=1}^k\lambda_j(\omega_i)^p\right)^{1/p},\qquad p\in\mathbb{N};$$

and

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\omega_2)\in\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)}\sum_{i=1}^2\Big(\prod_{j=1}^k\lambda_j(\omega_i)\Big)$$

admit a solution.

We will solve problem (2.1) by approaching it with a penalized problem having an additional parameter (recall system (1.9) in the Introduction). More precisely, the proof of Theorem 2.3 in this section will imply Theorem 1.6, (i)-(ii)-(iii), as well as the existence part of (iv). The proof of the remaining statements will be complete in Section 3.

At this point it is useful to recall that, if $\{v_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ represents the sequence of eigenfunctions of $(-\Delta,H_0^1(\Omega))$, then

$$\lambda_k(\Omega)=\inf\left\{\int_\Omega|\nabla v|^2:\ \int_\Omega\nabla v\cdot\nabla v_i\,dx=0,\ i=1,\dots,k-1\right\}.$$

Given $u\in H_0^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k)$, define the $k\times k$ symmetric matrix

$$M(u)=\Big(\int_\Omega\nabla u_i\cdot\nabla u_j\,dx\Big)_{i,j=1,\dots,k}.\tag{2.2}$$

Fix $2 < 2q < 2^*$, where $2^* = +\infty$ if $N \leqslant 2$, $2^* = 2N/(N-2)$ whenever $N \geqslant 3$. For each $\beta > 0$, we take the energy $E_\beta : H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k) \times H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$E_\beta(u,v) = \varphi(M(u)) + \varphi(M(v)) + \frac{2\beta}{q}\int_\Omega (u_1^2 + \ldots + u_k^2)^{\frac{q}{2}}(v_1^2 + \ldots + v_k^2)^{\frac{q}{2}}\,dx$$

and consider the energy levels

$$c_\beta := \inf\left\{E_\beta(u,v) : u,v \in \Sigma(L^2)\right\},$$

where

$$\Sigma(L^2) := \left\{w = (w_1,\ldots,w_k) \in H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k) : \int_\Omega w_i w_j\,dx = \delta_{ij} \text{ for every } i,j\right\}$$

(δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker symbol). In order to prove that c_β is achieved, we need three auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\varphi : \mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a map satisfying*

$$\varphi(M) = \varphi(P^T M P) \qquad \text{for all } M \in \mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } P \in \mathcal{O}_k(\mathbb{R}).$$

Given $u \in \Sigma(L^2)$, let $M(u)$ be defined as in (2.2). Then there exists $\tilde u \in \Sigma(L^2)$ such that

$$M(\tilde u) = \operatorname{diag}\left(\|\tilde u_1\|^2,\ldots,\|\tilde u_k\|^2\right),$$

and $\varphi(M(u)) = \varphi(M(\tilde u))$; moreover, $\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde u_i^2$ pointwise. In particular, $E_\beta(\tilde u,\tilde v) = E_\beta(u,v)$.

Proof. Let P be an orthogonal matrix such $P^T M(u) P$ is diagonal. Take the new elements

$$\begin{bmatrix}\tilde u_1\\ \vdots\\ \tilde u_k\end{bmatrix} = P^T \begin{bmatrix} u_1\\ \vdots\\ u_k\end{bmatrix} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \tilde u_i = \sum_{j=1}^k p_{ji}u_j,\ i = 1,\ldots,k.$$

Then, given any bilinear form $b : H^1_0(\Omega)\times H^1_0(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ and its associated matrix $B(u) = (b(u_i,u_j))_{ij}$, we have

$$b(\tilde u_i,\tilde u_j) = b\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k p_{li}u_l, \sum_{m=1}^k p_{mj}u_m\Big) = \sum_{l,m=1}^k p_{li}p_{mj}b(u_l,u_m) = (P^T B(u) P)_{ij}.$$

If one takes $b(w_1,w_2) := \int_\Omega w_1 w_2\,dx$, then as $u \in \Sigma(L^2)$ we have $B(u) = Id$ and

$$\int_\Omega \tilde u_i \tilde u_j\,dx = (P^T P)_{ij} = \delta_{ij},$$

hence $\tilde u \in \Sigma(L^2)$. If one takes $b(w_1,w_2) = \int_\Omega \nabla w_1 \cdot \nabla w_2\,dx$ instead, then

$$(M(\tilde u))_{ij} = (P^T M(u) P)_{ij},$$

hence $M(\tilde u)$ is a diagonal matrix.

As for the final statement of the lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^k \tilde u_i^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^k\sum_{l,m=1}^k p_{li}p_{mi}u_l u_m = \sum_{l,m=1}^k u_l u_m \sum_{i=1}^k p_{li}p_{mi}\\ &= \sum_{l,m=1}^k u_l u_m (PP^T)_{lm} = \sum_{l,m=1}^k u_l u_m \delta_{lm} = \sum_{l=1}^k u_l^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

This lemma implies that c_β has the equivalent characterization shown in the Introduction - see (1.8) - namely that it is the infimum of $E_\beta(u,v)$ for

$$u, v \in \Sigma(L^2) \quad \text{with} \quad \int_\Omega \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla u_j \, dx = \int_\Omega \nabla v_i \cdot \nabla v_j \, dx = 0 \ \forall i \neq j.$$

For such (u,v), observe that

$$E_\beta(u,v) \geqslant 2\psi(0,\dots,0), \qquad \text{and so } c_\beta \text{ is finite.}$$

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\varphi : \mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function such that*

$$\varphi(M) = \varphi(P^T M P) \qquad \text{for all } M \in \mathcal{S}_k(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } P \in \mathcal{O}_k(\mathbb{R}).$$

Then $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ij}}(D) = 0$ for every diagonal matrix D, and $j > i$.

Proof. Let us check it for instance for $i = 1 \neq 2 = j$. First take a matrix $D = \operatorname{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_k)$ such that $d_1 \neq d_2$. Consider $P(t) \in \mathcal{O}_k(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$P(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos t & -\sin t & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \sin t & \cos t & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

which satisfies $P(0) = Id$ and

$$P'(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{dt}(P(t)^T D P(t)) = P'(0)^T D P(0) + P(0)^T D P'(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_2 - d_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ d_2 - d_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and since by assumption the map $t \mapsto \varphi(P(t)^T D P(t))$ is constant,

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{12}}(D)(d_2 - d_1) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{12}}(D) = 0 \text{ since } d_1 \neq d_2.$$

As the set of diagonal matrices satisfying $d_1 \neq d_2$ is obviously dense among the set of all diagonal matrices (identified with $\mathbb{R}^k$), since φ is C^1 we get that $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{12}}(D) = 0$ for every diagonal matrix D. The proof in the other cases is analogous, by suitably choosing the family of matrices $P(t)$. □

Let us check that $\Sigma(L^2)$ is a manifold.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $G : H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k) \to \mathbb{R}^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}$ defined by*

$$G(w) = (g_{ij}(w))_{j\geqslant i} := \left(\int_\Omega w_i w_j\,dx\right)_{j\geqslant i},$$

so that $\Sigma(L^2) = \{w \in H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k) :\ g_{ij}(w) = \delta_{ij}\ \forall j \geqslant i\}$. Then $G'(u)$ is onto for each $u \in \Sigma(L^2)$. In particular, the set $\Sigma(L^2)$ is a submanifold of $H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k)$ of codimension $k(k+1)/2$.

Proof. Given $u \in \Sigma(L^2)$, we have

$$G'(u)(\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_k) = \left(\int_\Omega (\varphi_m u_n + u_m\varphi_n)\right)_{n\geqslant m} = (g'_{mn}(u)(\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_k))_{n\geqslant m}.$$

In order to prove that $G'(u)$ is onto, let us prove that every vector of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}$ is the image through $G'(u)$ of an element in $H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k)$. Fix $i,j \in \{1,\dots,k\}$ with $j \geqslant i$; then by taking $\bar\varphi := (\bar\varphi_1,\dots,\bar\varphi_k)$ with $\bar\varphi_j = u_i$, $\bar\varphi_l = 0$ for $l \neq i$, we obtain

$$g'_{ij}(u)\bar\varphi = \int_\Omega u_i^2\,dx = 1 \ \ (\text{if } i \neq j), \qquad \text{or} \qquad g'_{ij}(u)\bar\varphi = \int_\Omega 2u_i^2\,dx = 2 \ \ (\text{if } i = j),$$

and

$$g'_{mn}(u)\bar\varphi = 0 \qquad \forall (m,n) \neq (i,j),\ n \geqslant m.$$

Thus $G'(u)$ is onto and the result follows. □

Let us now fix once and for all some $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}$, and denote by ψ its restriction to the space of $k \times k$ diagonal matrices.

Theorem 2.8. *Given $\beta > 0$, the infimum c_β is attained at $u_\beta, v_\beta \in \Sigma(L^2)$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_{i,\beta}\cdot\nabla u_{j,\beta}\,dx = \int_\Omega \nabla v_{i,\beta}\cdot\nabla v_{j,\beta}\,dx = 0 \qquad \text{whenever } i \neq j.$$

Moreover, for each i we have

$$\text{(2.3)} \qquad \begin{cases} -a_{i,\beta}\Delta u_{i,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_{ij,\beta}u_{j,\beta} - \beta u_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \\ -b_{i,\beta}\Delta v_{i,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^k \nu_{ij,\beta}v_{j,\beta} - \beta v_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \end{cases}$$

with

$$a_{i,\beta} = \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\xi_{ii}}(M(u_\beta)) = \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial a_i}(M(u_\beta)), \qquad b_{i,\beta} = \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\xi_{ii}}(M(v_\beta)) = \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial a_i}(M(v_\beta)),$$

and

$$\text{(2.4)} \quad \mu_{ij,\beta} = \mu_{ji,\beta} = \delta_{ij}a_{i,\beta}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{i,\beta}|^2\,dx + \beta\int_\Omega u_{i,\beta}u_{j,\beta}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k u_{l,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k v_{l,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}}dx,$$

$$\nu_{ij,\beta} = \nu_{ji,\beta} = \delta_{ij}b_{i,\beta}\int_\Omega |\nabla v_{i,\beta}|^2\,dx + \beta\int_\Omega v_{i,\beta}v_{j,\beta}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k v_{l,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k u_{l,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}}dx.$$

Remark 2.9. We observe that, although the quantity $q/2-1$ needs not to be positive, there occur no singularities in the expressions above. In fact, for every $u \in H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k)$ we have that

$$\int_\Omega |u_iu_j|\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k u_l^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k v_l^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}}dx \leqslant \int_\Omega \Big(\sum_{l=1}^k u_l^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k v_l^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}}dx < \infty,$$

as $2q < 2^*$.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Fix $\beta > 0$ and let us take a minimizing sequence $u_n = (u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{k,n})$, $v_n = (v_{1,n}, \dots, v_{k,n})$. By the Ekeland's variational principle we can suppose that $u_n, v_n \in \Sigma(L^2)$ is such that

$$E_\beta(u_n, v_n) \to c_\beta \qquad \text{and} \qquad E_\beta|'_{\Sigma(L^2)}(u_n, v_n) \to 0 \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

(taking also in consideration Lemma 2.7).

Consider the functions $\tilde u_n$, $\tilde v_n$ defined in Lemma 2.5. As $E_\beta(u, v) = E_\beta(Pu, Pv)$ for every $u, v \in H^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$, $P \in \mathcal{O}_k(\mathbb{R})$, then

$$E_\beta(\tilde u_n, \tilde v_n) = E_\beta(u_n, v_n) \to c_\beta \qquad \text{and} \qquad E_\beta|'_{\Sigma(L^2)}(\tilde u_n, \tilde v_n) \to 0. \tag{2.5}$$

The first convergence implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\beta(\tilde u_n, \tilde v_n) \;&=\; \psi\Big(\|\tilde u_{1,n}\|^2, \dots, \|\tilde u_{k,n}\|^2\Big) + \psi\Big(\|\tilde v_{1,n}\|^2, \dots, \int_\Omega \|\tilde v_{k,n}\|^2\Big) \\ &\quad + \frac{2\beta}{p} \int_\Omega \Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde u_{j,n}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde v_{j,n}\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} dx \leqslant c_\beta + 1, \qquad \forall n \text{ large.} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_\Omega \tilde u_{i,n}^2\, dx = 1$, we must have $\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde u_{i,n}|^2\, dx \geqslant \delta > 0$ for all n, and thus since $\psi \to +\infty$ as $s_i \to +\infty$ for some i, we deduce that $\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde u_{i,n}|^2\, dx \leqslant C$ for all i and n. Analogously $\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde v_{i,n}|^2\, dx \leqslant C$ and hence there exists $(\tilde u, \tilde v) \in \Sigma(L^2)$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\tilde u_{i,n} \rightharpoonup \tilde u_i, \quad \tilde v_{i,n} \rightharpoonup \tilde v_i \qquad \text{weakly in } H^1_0(\Omega), \text{ strongly in } L^r(\Omega)\ (1 \leqslant r < 2^*), \text{ a.e } x \in \Omega.$$

The second condition in (2.5) together with Lemma 2.6 implies the existence of $\tilde\mu_{ij,n}$, $\tilde\nu_{ij,n}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(\tilde u_n))\Delta \tilde u_{i,n} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde\mu_{ij,n}\tilde u_{j,n} - \beta \tilde u_{i,n}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde u_{j,n}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde v_{j,n}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} + \mathrm{o}_n(1) \\ -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(\tilde v_n))\Delta \tilde v_{i,n} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde\nu_{ij,n}\tilde v_{j,n} - \beta \tilde v_{i,n}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde v_{j,n}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \tilde u_{j,n}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} + \mathrm{o}_n(1) \end{aligned}$$

in $H^{-1}(\Omega)$. Observe that

$$\tilde\mu_{ij,n} = \delta_{ij}\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(\tilde u_n)) \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde u_{i,n}|^2\, dx + \beta \int_\Omega \tilde u_{i,n}\tilde u_{j,n}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k \tilde u_{l,n}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^k \tilde v_{l,n}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} dx + \mathrm{o}(\|\tilde u_{j,n}\|)$$

is bounded independently of n. Thus, by multiplying the i–th equation for $\tilde u_n$ by $\tilde u_{i,n} - \tilde u_i$ we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(\tilde u_n)) \int_\Omega \nabla \tilde u_{i,n} \cdot \nabla(\tilde u_{i,n} - \tilde u_i)\, dx = \mathrm{o}_n(1).$$

As $\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde u_{1,n}|^2\, dx, \dots, \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde u_{k,n}|^2\, dx\Big)$ lies in a compact set not containing the origin and $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a_i} > 0$ on $(\mathbb{R}^+)^k$, we have that $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(\tilde u_n)) \geqslant \delta > 0$ for all i and n. Hence $\tilde u_{i,n} \to \tilde u_i$ strongly in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ and, analogously, $\tilde v_{i,n} \to \tilde v_i$. In conclusion, for any $i \neq j$ we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \tilde u_i \cdot \nabla \tilde u_j\, dx = \lim_n \int_\Omega \nabla \tilde u_{i,n} \cdot \nabla \tilde u_{j,n}\, dx = 0, \qquad \int_\Omega \nabla \tilde v_i \cdot \nabla \tilde v_j\, dx = \lim_n \int_\Omega \nabla \tilde v_{i,n} \cdot \nabla \tilde v_{j,n}\, dx = 0,$$

and $E_\beta(\tilde u_i, \tilde v_i) = c_\beta$. The last paragraph of the statement is a consequence of the Lagrange multiplier rule, by recalling once again Lemma 2.7. □

Observe that (2.3) is a type of competitive system where competition occurs between groups of components. In fact, if one thinks of each u_i and v_i as being a population density, then no competition occurs between different u_i's, or between different v_i's, but each element of $\{u_1,\dots,u_k\}$ competes with each element of $\{v_1,\dots,v_k\}$. A Lotka-Volterra (non variational) type competition of this kind was considered in the paper by Caffarelli and F.-H. Lin [12].

2.2. **Uniform bounds in Hölder spaces. Proof of the general existence theorem.** Our next goal is to pass to the limit $\beta\to\infty$ in (2.3), relating the limiting profiles with problem c_∞. Having this in mind, first we establish some uniform bounds (in β) in the L^∞–norm, and then in Hölder spaces. Throughout this subsection, we take (u_β,v_β) as in Theorem 2.8.

Lemma 2.10. *We have $c_\beta\leqslant c_\infty$ for every $\beta>0$. In particular this implies that $\|(u_\beta,v_\beta)\|_{H^1_0(\Omega)}$ and $\|(u_\beta,v_\beta)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ are bounded independently of β.*

Proof. 1. Given $(\omega_1,\omega_2)\in\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)$, consider the first k eigenfunctions $\bar u=(\bar u_1,\dots,\bar u_k)$ of $-\Delta$ in $H^1_0(\omega_1)$, orthonormal in L^2, and the first k L^2-orthonormal eigenfunctions $\bar v=(\bar v_1,\dots,\bar v_k)$ of $-\Delta$ in $H^1_0(\omega_2)$, so that $\bar u,\bar v\in\Sigma(L^2)$. Then, since $\omega_1\cap\omega_2=\emptyset$,

$$\psi(\lambda_1(\omega_1),\dots,\lambda_k(\omega_1))+\psi(\lambda_1(\omega_2),\dots,\lambda_k(\omega_2))=\varphi(M(\bar u))+\varphi(M(\bar v))=E_\beta(\bar u,\bar v)\geqslant c_\beta$$

for all $\beta>0$, hence $c_\beta\leqslant c_\infty$.

2. As $\displaystyle\int_\Omega\beta(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2)^{\frac q2}(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2)^{\frac q2}\,dx\geqslant 0$ and $\psi|_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^k}\geqslant\psi(0,\dots,0)$, we obtain that

$$\psi\left(\|u_{1,\beta}\|^2,\dots,\|u_{k,\beta}\|^2\right),\quad \psi\left(\|v_{1,\beta}\|^2,\dots,\|v_{k,\beta}\|^2\right)$$

and also

$$\int_\Omega\beta\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac q2}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac q2}\,dx$$

are bounded from above, independently of β. Since $u_\beta,v_\beta\in\Sigma(L^2)$, we have $\|u_{i,\beta}\|^2,\|v_{i,\beta}\|^2\geqslant\delta>0$, and by the assumptions made for ψ we obtain uniform H^1_0 bounds for u_β,v_β.

3. To prove the L^∞ bounds, observe first of all that the conclusions of the previous point imply the existence of $\bar\mu$ such that $|\mu_{ij,\beta}|\leqslant\bar\mu$ for every i,j and β, where $\mu_{ij,\beta}$ are the Lagrange multipliers defined in (2.4). Moreover, there exists $\underline{a}>0$ such that $a_{i,\beta}\geqslant\underline{a}$. If we combine equation (2.3) with the Kato inequality [2] we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}-\Delta|u_{i,\beta}|&\leqslant-\mathrm{sign}(u_{i,\beta})\Delta u_{i,\beta}\\&=\sum_{j=1}^k\frac{\mu_{ij,\beta}}{a_{i,\beta}}\mathrm{sign}(u_{i,\beta})u_{j,\beta}-\frac{\beta}{a_{i,\beta}}\mathrm{sign}(u_{i,\beta})u_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac q2-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac q2}\\&\leqslant\frac{\bar\mu}{\underline{a}}\sum_{j=1}^k|u_{j,\beta}|.\end{aligned}$$

Summing up in i yields

$$-\Delta\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k|u_{i,\beta}|\Big)\leqslant\frac{k\bar\mu}{\underline{a}}\sum_{i=1}^k|u_{i,\beta}|.$$

[2]The Kato inequality (see for instance [35, Th. 21.19]) states that given $u\in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$ with $\Delta u\in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$, then $\mathrm{sign}(u)\Delta u\leqslant\Delta|u|$.

Since a similar statement holds for $\sum_{i=1}^k |v_{i,\beta}|$, we can conclude by using a standard Brezis-Kato type argument together with the H^1_0 bounds. □

Theorem 2.11. *There exists $(u,v) \in H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^k) \cap C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega};\mathbb{R}^k)$ ($\forall 0<\alpha<1$) such that, up to a subsequence, as $\beta \to +\infty$,*

(i) *$u_\beta \to u$, $v_\beta \to v$ in $C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$;*

(ii) *$u_i \cdot v_j \equiv 0$ in Ω $\forall i,j$; $u,v \in \Sigma(L^2)$, and $\displaystyle\int_\Omega \beta(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2)^{\frac{q}{2}}(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2)^{\frac{q}{2}}\,dx \to 0$.*

(iii) *Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} -a_i\Delta u_i &= \mu_i u_i \qquad \text{in } \omega_u := \{x\in\Omega : u_1^2+\ldots+u_k^2>0\},\\ -b_i\Delta v_i &= \nu_i v_i \qquad \text{in } \omega_v := \{x\in\Omega : v_1^2+\ldots+v_k^2>0\}\end{aligned}$$

for $a_i = \lim_\beta a_{i,\beta}$, $b_i = \lim_\beta b_{i,\beta}$, $\mu_i = \lim_\beta \mu_{ii,\beta}$, $\nu_i = \lim_\beta \nu_{ii,\beta}$. Finally, for every $i=1,\ldots,k$, $x_0\in\Omega$, $r\in(0,\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Omega))$,

$$a_i\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u_i|^2\,dx = a_i\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} u_i\,\partial_n u_i\,d\sigma + \mu_i\int_{B_r(x_0)} u_i^2\,dx$$

and

$$b_i\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla v_i|^2\,dx = b_i\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} v_i\,\partial_n v_i\,d\sigma + \nu_i\int_{B_r(x_0)} v_i^2\,dx.$$

Proof. (i) The proof of this point is made by contradiction. Namely, we assume that

$$L_\beta := \max_{i,j=1,\ldots,k}\left\{\max_{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}}\frac{|u_{j,\beta}(x)-u_{j,\beta}(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha}, \max_{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}}\frac{|v_{i,\beta}(x)-v_{i,\beta}(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha}\right\} \to +\infty$$

and will reach a contradiction. The argument is very close to the one in [29, Section 3] (there the authors deal with positive solutions and moreover $q=2$, $k=1$ and $a_{i,\beta}=b_{i,\beta}=1$) and therefore we merely focus on the technical differences with respect to [29].

Step A. We may assume that L_β is achieved by the component $u_{1,\beta}$, say at the pair (x_β,y_β) with $|x_\beta-y_\beta|\to 0$. Accordingly, for a given sequence $r_\beta\to 0$ to be chosen later on, we define the rescaled functions

$$\bar u_{i,\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{L_\beta r_\beta^\alpha}\,u_{i,\beta}(x_\beta + r_\beta x), \qquad \bar v_{i,\beta}(x) = \frac{1}{L_\beta r_\beta^\alpha}\,v_{i,\beta}(x_\beta + r_\beta x),$$

for $x\in\Omega_\beta := \frac{\Omega-x_\beta}{r_\beta}$. It follows that

$$\begin{cases} -a_{i,\beta}\Delta\bar u_{i,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^k r_\beta^2\mu_{ij,\beta}\bar u_{j,\beta} - \beta M_\beta \bar u_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \bar u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \bar v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \\ -b_{i,\beta}\Delta\bar v_{i,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^k r_\beta^2\nu_{ij,\beta}\bar v_{j,\beta} - \beta M_\beta \bar v_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \bar v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k \bar u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{q}{2}} \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

with

$$M_\beta = L_\beta^{2q-2} r_\beta^{2\alpha(q-1)+2}, \qquad \delta\leqslant a_{i,\beta},\ b_{i,\beta}\leqslant C, \quad |\mu_{ij,\beta}|,\ |\nu_{ij,\beta}|\leqslant C.$$

We observe that

$$r_\beta^2\|\bar u_{j,\beta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\beta)} + r_\beta^2\|\bar v_{j,\beta}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_\beta)} \to 0$$

and also that

$$\max_{i,j=1,\dots,k}\left\{\max_{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}_\beta}\frac{|\bar u_{j,\beta}(x)-\bar u_{j,\beta}(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha},\max_{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}_\beta}\frac{|\bar v_{i,\beta}(x)-\bar v_{i,\beta}(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha}\right\}$$
$$=\frac{|\bar u_{1,\beta}(0)-\bar u_{1,\beta}(\frac{y_\beta-x_\beta}{r_\beta})|}{|\frac{y_\beta-x_\beta}{r_\beta}|^\alpha}=1.$$

We next prove two claims which correspond to Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 in [29].

Claim 1. *Whenever r_β is such that*

$$\liminf_{\beta\to\infty}\beta M_\beta>0\qquad\text{and}\qquad\limsup_{\beta\to\infty}\frac{|x_\beta-y_\beta|}{r_\beta}<\infty \tag{2.7}$$

then both sequences

$$d_\beta:=\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2(0)\qquad\text{and}\qquad e_\beta:=\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2(0)$$

are bounded as $\beta\to\infty$.

Take $R\geqslant|x_\beta-y_\beta|/r_\beta$. For sufficiently large β, one has $B_{2R}(0)\subseteq\Omega_\beta$. Take η a smooth cutoff function such that $\eta=1$ in $B_R(0)$ and $\eta=0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_{2R}(0)$. By testing the first equation in (2.6) with $\bar u_{i,\beta}\eta^2$ and the second one with $\bar v_{i,\beta}\eta^2$, we find out that

$$\beta M_\beta\int_{B_R(0)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2\right)^{q/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2\right)^{q/2}dx\leqslant C\int_{B_{2R}(0)}\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2\,dx$$

and

$$\beta M_\beta\int_{B_R(0)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2\right)^{q/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2\right)^{q/2}dx\leqslant C\int_{B_{2R}(0)}\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2\,dx. \tag{2.8}$$

Since $\bar u_{i,\beta}$ and $\bar v_{i,\beta}$ are Hölder continuous and (2.7) holds, there exist $C_1,C_2>0$ (depending only on $R>0$) such that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2(x)\right)^{q/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2(x)\right)^{q/2}dx\leqslant C_1\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2(x)\right)+C_2$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2(x)\right)^{q/2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2(x)\right)^{q/2}dx\leqslant C_1\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2(x)\right)+C_2.$$

for every $x\in B_R(0)$. In particular,

$$(d_\beta\,e_\beta)^q\leqslant(C_1d_\beta+C_2)(C_1e_\beta+C_3).$$

Since $q>1$, we cannot have that *both* sequences are unbounded.

Assume first of all that $d_\beta\to+\infty$ (up to a subsequence), and e_β is bounded, so that in particular

$$\inf_{B_{2R}(0)}\sum_{i=1}^k\bar u_{i,\beta}^2\to+\infty,\quad\text{and}\quad\sup_{B_{2R}(0)}\sum_{i=1}^k\bar v_{i,\beta}^2\text{ is bounded},$$

and actually

$$\sup_{B_{2R}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bar{v}_{i,\beta}^2 \to 0 \quad \text{as } \beta \to \infty.$$

Combining this with (2.8) gives

$$\beta M_\beta \int_{B_R(0)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \bar{u}_{i,\beta}^2 \right)^{q/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \bar{v}_{i,\beta}^2 \right)^{q/2} dx \to 0.$$

Going back to the system, we conclude that $\|\Delta \bar{u}_{i,\beta}\|_{L^1(B_R(0))} \to 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, k$ and every large $R > 0$. In particular, the sequence $\tilde{u}_\beta(x) := \bar{u}_{1,\beta}(x) - \bar{u}_{1,\beta}(0)$ converges uniformly in compact sets to a non constant, harmonic, Hölder continuous function in Ω_∞, where Ω_∞ is either $\mathbb{R}^N$ or a half-space of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Arguing as in [29, p. 282], this contradicts the Liouville type theorem stated in [29]

In conclusion, we have shown that $(d_\beta)_\beta$ is bounded. The case when $(e_\beta)_\beta$ can be handled in an analogous way, and thus the claim is established.

Claim 2. *We have that*

$$\beta L_\beta^{2q-2} |x_\beta - y_\beta|^{2\alpha(q-1)+2} \to \infty.$$

Indeed, assuming the contrary, by letting

$$r_\beta^{-1} = \left(\beta L_\beta^{2q-2} \right)^{2\alpha(q-1)+2} \to \infty$$

we find ourselves in the situation displayed in (2.7), with $\beta M_\beta = 1$. According to Claim 1 and up to subsequences, we conclude that $\bar{u}_{i,\beta} \to u_{i,\infty}$, $\bar{v}_{i,\beta} \to v_{i,\infty}$ uniformly in compact sets, and

$$\begin{cases} -a_i \Delta u_{i,\infty} = -u_{i,\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_{j,\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} v_{j,\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \\ -b_i \Delta v_{i,\infty} = -v_{i,\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} v_{j,\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_{j,\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, all these functions are Hölder continuous and $u_{1,\infty}$ is non constant. As explained in [29, p. 283], the case where the system holds in a half-space is easier to handle with, and so we assume henceforth that this limit problem holds in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^N$. Let us denote $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |u_{i,\infty}|$, $v = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |v_{i,\infty}|$. Since $a_i, b_i \geqslant \delta > 0 \ \forall i$ and since

$$|u| \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_{j,\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \geqslant |u|^{q-1}, \qquad \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_{j,\infty}^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \geqslant c|u|^q,$$

for some $c > 0$ (and similarly for v), we find that

$$-\Delta |u| \leqslant -c|u|^{q-1}|v|^q, \qquad -\Delta |v| \leqslant -c|v|^{q-1}|u|^q. \tag{2.9}$$

We may assume that $c = 1$ by possibly replacing u and v with $c^{1/(2q-2)}u$ and $c^{1/(2q-2)}v$ respectively. Suppose first that $|u|\,|v| \equiv 0$, so that $-\Delta|u| \leqslant 0$ and $-\Delta|v| \leqslant 0$. It follows then from [29, Proposition 2.2] that $v = 0$ and so $u_{1,\infty}$ is a non constant, harmonic, Hölder continuous function in $\mathbb{R}^N$, in contradiction with [29, Corollary 2.3]. Assume now that $|u(x_0)|\,|v(x_0)| \neq 0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$; since the problem is invariant by translation, we may assume that $x_0 = 0$. Then we argue precisely as in the proof of [29, Proposition 2.6] to conclude that again $v = 0$, thus finishing the proof of Claim 2.

For the sake of clarity, we explicitly mention the only part of the argument where an extra care with respect to [29] is in order, due to the fact that here possibly $q \neq 2$. The main step in the proof of [29, Proposition 2.6] consists in showing (cf. [29, Lemma 2.5]) that, given $\varepsilon > 0$, the function

$$J(r) := \frac{1}{r^{4-\varepsilon}} \int_{B_r(0)} f(|x|) \left(|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^q |v|^q\right) dx \int_{B_r(0)} f(|x|) \left(|\nabla v|^2 + |u|^q |v|^q\right) dx$$

associated to (2.9) is increasing for r sufficiently large, where f is a suitable cut-off function. This property, in turn, relies on the study of the quantities

$$\Lambda_1(r) := \frac{\int_{\partial B_1(0)} \left(|\nabla_\theta u_{(r)}|^2 + r^2 |u_{(r)}|^q |v_{(r)}|^q\right) d\sigma}{\int_{\partial B_1(0)} u_{(r)}^2 d\sigma},$$
$$\Lambda_2(r) := \frac{\int_{\partial B_1(0)} \left(|\nabla_\theta v_{(r)}|^2 + r^2 |u_{(r)}|^q |v_{(r)}|^q\right) d\sigma}{\int_{\partial B_1(0)} v_{(r)}^2 d\sigma},$$

where $r_{(r)}(\theta) := u(r\theta)$, $v_{(r)}(\theta) := v(r\theta)$. Arguing as in [29, p. 275], assume that $\Lambda_1(r_n)$ and $\Lambda_2(r_n)$ are bounded sequences along a sequence $r_n \to \infty$. In particular,

$$r_n^2 \int_{\partial B_1(0)} |u_{(r_n)}|^q |v_{(r_n)}|^q \, d\sigma \text{ is less than or equal to } C \int_{\partial B_1(0)} u_{(r_n)}^2 \, d\sigma \text{ and } C \int_{\partial B_1(0)} v_{(r_n)}^2 \, d\sigma.$$

By multiplying these inequalities we find that

$$r_n^2 \int_{\partial B_1(0)} |u_{(r_n)}|^q |v_{(r_n)}|^q \, d\sigma \leqslant C^2 \|u_{(r_n)}\|_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))} \|v_{(r_n)}\|_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))}.$$

In particular, since $p > 1$ and since both sequences $||u_{(r_n)}||_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))}$ and $||v_{(r_n)}||_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))}$ are bounded away from zero (this a consequence of the fact that both $|u|$ and $|v|$ are subharmonic functions such that $u(0) \neq 0$, $v(0) \neq 0$), we deduce from the previous inequality that

$$r_n^2 \int_{\partial B_1(0)} |u_{(r_n)}|^q |v_{(r_n)}|^q \, d\sigma \leqslant C' \|u_{(r_n)}\|^q_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))} \|v_{(r_n)}\|^q_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))}$$

for some $C' > 0$. By using this estimate we can apply the remaining argument in [29, p. 275] to conclude the proof of Claim 2.

Step B. Once Claims 1 and 2 are established, one proceeds as follows. Let

$$r_\beta = |x_\beta - y_\beta|.$$

With this choice of r_β we have that $\beta M_\beta \to \infty$ (cf. Claim 2) and so, according to Claim 1 and up to subsequences, we have that $\bar{u}_{i,\beta} \to u_{i,\infty}$ and $\bar{v}_{i,\beta} \to v_{i,\infty}$ uniformly in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$, and $u_{1,\infty}$ is non constant. Moreover, by proceeding exactly as in Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 in [29], we deduce that these convergences hold in $H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\beta M_\beta \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{u}_{i,\beta}^2\right)^{q/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{v}_{i,\beta}^2\right)^{q/2} \to 0$ in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\left(\sum_{i=1}^k u_{i,\infty}^2\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^k v_{i,\infty}^2\right) \equiv 0$, $-a_i \Delta u_{i,\infty} = 0$ in $\{x : \sum_{i=1}^k u_{i,\infty}^2(x) > 0\}$, and $-b_i \Delta v_{i,\infty} = 0$ in $\{x : \sum_{i=1}^k v_{i,\infty}^2(x) > 0\}$.

A contradiction is then reached as in [29, p. 293]. We outline the argument. The main tool in reaching such a contradiction is a monotonicity formula applied to the Almgren quotients

$$N(x_0, r) = \frac{E(x_0, r)}{H(x_0, r)} \qquad (x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N, \ r > 0),$$

where, in the present setting,

$$E(x_0,r) := \frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i |\nabla u_{i,\infty}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i |\nabla v_{i,\infty}|^2 \right) dx$$

and

$$H(x_0,r) := \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i u_{i,\infty}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i v_{i,\infty}^2 \right) d\sigma.$$

Namely, one can prove (cf. [29, Proposition 3.9]) that $N(x_0,r)$ is a non decreasing function and

$$\frac{d}{dr} \log(H(x_0,r)) = \frac{2N(x_0,r)}{r} \qquad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N,\ r>0.$$

Due to the presence of the terms $a_i = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(u_\infty))$ and $b_i = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(v_\infty))$ (which are absent in [29]), this monotonicity formula will be proved in full detail in the next subsection, in a slightly different context which will also be needed later on. Then we conclude as follows. We denote $U = \sum_{i=1}^k u_{i,\infty}^2$, $V = \sum_{i=1}^k v_{i,\infty}^2$, so that $U\,V \equiv 0$, $-\Delta U \leqslant 0$ and $-\Delta V \leqslant 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Since $U \not\equiv 0$, V must vanish somewhere in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Also, U must vanish at some point, otherwise $u_{1,\infty}$ would a non constant, harmonic, Hölder continuous function in $\mathbb{R}^N$, in contradiction in [29, Corollary 2.3]. Thus, by continuity, U and V must have a common zero point. Since moreover they are both non negative, sub-harmonic and Hölder continuous in $\mathbb{R}^N$, we deduce from [29, Proposition 2.2] that

$$V = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \{x : U(x) > 0\} \text{ is a proper connected subset of } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Now, let $\Gamma := \{x : U(x) = 0\}$. Since U is α-Hölder continuous, by using the above mentioned Almgren monotonicity formula one finds out that

$$N(x_0,r) = \alpha \qquad \forall x_0 \in \Gamma,\ r>0,$$

which turns out to be equivalent to the statement that $u_{i,\infty}$ is given in polar coordinates around x_0 by $u_{i,\infty}(x) = r^\alpha g_i(\theta)$ for some function g_i ($i=1,\dots,k$, $r=|x-x_0|$, $\theta=(x-x_0)/r$). Since this procedure can be applied to any given $x_0 \in \Gamma$, we conclude that Γ is a cone with respect to each of its points, and so Γ is a (proper) subspace of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Gamma$ is connected and so Γ has dimension at most $N-2$; in particular, it has zero capacity. As a consequence, $u_{1,\infty}$ is a non constant, harmonic, Hölder continuous function in the whole of $\mathbb{R}^N$, in contradiction in [29, Corollary 2.3].

This final contradiction establishes the property (i) in Theorem 2.11.

(ii) The proof of this fact is much simpler and follows precisely as in [29, p. 294].

(iii) We multiply the i–th equation for u in (2.3) by u_i, integrate by parts and pass to the limit, by observing that, thanks to (2.4), $\mu_{ij,\beta} \to 0$ for $i \neq j$ as $\beta \to \infty$. A full proof of a stronger result will be presented ahead in Proposition 2.25.

□

The following corollary implies in particular Theorem 2.3, as well as Theorem 1.6 (i)-(ii)-(iii) except the statement of Lipschitz continuity and the equality between sets in (ii).

Corollary 2.12. *We have the following alternative characterization for c_∞:*

$$c_\infty = \inf \left\{ \varphi(M(w)) + \varphi(M(z)) :\ w,z \in \Sigma(L^2),\ w_i \cdot z_j = 0\ \forall i,j \right\}.$$

Moreover, for

$$\omega_u := \{u_1^2 + \ldots + u_k^2 > 0\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \omega_v := \{v_1^2 + \ldots + v_k^2 > 0\},$$

where u and v are given by Theorem 2.11, we have that $(\omega_u, \omega_v) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)$ achieves c_∞. In particular, Theorem 2.3 is proved.

Proof. As a result of the strong convergences proved in the previous theorem, we have that $u_i v_j = 0\ \forall i,j$, $\int_\Omega \nabla u_i \cdot \nabla u_j = \int_\Omega \nabla v_i \cdot \nabla v_j = 0\ \forall i \neq j$ and $u, v \in \Sigma(L^2)$. Thus, by the monotonicity property of ψ,

$$\begin{aligned}
c_\infty &\geqslant \lim_{\beta\to\infty} c_\beta \\
&= \lim_{\beta\to\infty} \varphi(M(u_\beta)) + \varphi(M(v_\beta)) + \frac{2\beta}{p}\int_\Omega (u_{1,\beta}^2 + \ldots + u_{k,\beta}^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} (v_{1,\beta}^2 + \ldots + v_{k,\beta}^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}\, dx \\
&= \varphi(M(u)) + \varphi(M(v)) \\
&= \psi\left(\|u_1\|^2, \ldots, \|u_k\|^2\right) + \psi\left(\|v_1\|^2, \ldots, \|v_k\|^2\right) \\
&\geqslant \psi(\lambda_1(\omega_u), \ldots, \lambda_k(\omega_u)) + \psi(\lambda_1(\omega_v), \ldots, \lambda_k(\omega_v)) \\
&\geqslant c_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We end this subsection by showing that, as a consequence of the minimization, the equations in Theorem 2.11-(iii) for u_i and v_i hold in the (apparently) larger sets $\widetilde{\omega}_u := \Omega \setminus \overline{\omega_v}$, $\widetilde{\omega}_v := \Omega \setminus \overline{\omega_u}$. It is easy to check that $\omega_u \subseteq \widetilde{\omega}_u$, $\omega_v \subseteq \widetilde{\omega}_v$; later on we will check that these sets coincide (cf. Corollary 2.24).

Proposition 2.13. *The following holds for every i:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&- a_i \Delta u_i = \mu_i u_i \text{ in the open set } \widetilde{\omega}_u, \\
&- b_i \Delta v_i = \nu_i v_i \text{ in the open set } \widetilde{\omega}_v.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. 1. As we will see, this is an immediate consequence of the Lagrange multiplier rule, and it is related to the fact that (u, v) solves a minimization problem. To fix ideas, let us just prove that

$$-a_1 \Delta u_1 = \mu_1 u_1 \qquad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\omega_v}.$$

Consider the functional $J : H_0^1(\tilde{\omega}_u) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $J(w) = \varphi(M(w, u_2, \ldots, u_k)) + \varphi(M(v))$ and the set

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ w \in H_0^1(\tilde{\omega}_u) : G(w) := \left(\int_{\tilde{\omega}_u} w^2\, dx, \int_{\tilde{\omega}_u} w u_2\, dx, \ldots, \int_{\tilde{\omega}_u} w u_k\, dx \right) = (1, 0, \ldots, 0) \right\}.$$

We observe that $\mathcal{M}$ is a manifold in a neighborhood of u, since $G'(u)$ is onto. Indeed, $G'(u)u_i$ is equal to $2e_i$ if $i = 1$, and $G'(u)u_i = e_i$ if $i \geqslant 2$, where e_i denotes the i–th vector of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^k$.

2. The infimum

$$\inf\{J(w) :\ w \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

is attained at $w = u_1$. In fact, suppose in view of a contradiction that there exists $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $J(\bar{w}) < J(u_1) = \varphi(M(u)) + \varphi(M(v))$. Denote by $\tilde{w}$ the extension of $\bar{w}$ by 0 to Ω. Then $(\tilde{w}, u_2, \ldots, u_k) \in \Sigma(L^2)$ and $\tilde{w} \cdot v_j \equiv 0$ for every j, as $\tilde{w} = 0$ on $\{v_1^2 + \ldots + v_k^2 > 0\}$. Thus we get a contradiction with the first statement of Corollary 2.12.

3. By the Lagrange multipliers rule, there exists $\tilde{\mu}_1$ such that

$$-a_1\Delta u_1 = \tilde{\mu}_1 u_1 \qquad \text{in } \tilde{\omega}_u.$$

Let us now check that $\tilde{\mu}_1 = \mu_1$. Since by passing to the limit as $\beta \to +\infty$ in (2.4) yields $a_1 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_1|^2\, dx = \mu_1$, the result follows. □

2.3. **Almgren's Monotonicity Formula.** Let (u, v) be the limiting profile provided by Theorem 2.11, achieving c_∞. Our aim is to continue to characterize this limit. We will prove an Almgren Monotonicity Formula (Theorem 2.21), which will imply the Lipschitz continuity of u and v, and will have a central role in the proof of the regularity of the free boundary in the next section. As a first step towards the monotonicity formula, we need to establish some general integral identities, which are the subject of the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $H : \mathbb{R}^{2k} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function such that $H|(s,t)| \leqslant C(1 + |s| + |t|)^{2^*}$ for every $s, t \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and take $l_i, m_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let $w = (w_1, \dots, w_k)$, $z = (z_1, \dots, z_k)$ be a smooth solution of*

$$-l_i\Delta u_i = H_{w_i}(w, z), \qquad -m_i\Delta v_i = H_{z_i}(w, z). \tag{2.10}$$

Then for every vector field $Y \in C^1_c(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^k l_i \int_\Omega \left(\langle dY \nabla w_i, \nabla w_i\rangle - \frac{1}{2} divY |\nabla w_i|^2 \right) dx \\ + \sum_{i=1}^k m_i \int_\Omega \left(\langle dY \nabla z_i, \nabla z_i\rangle - \frac{1}{2} divY |\nabla z_i|^2 \right) dx \\ + \int_\Omega H(w, z)\, divY\, dx = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider a field $Y \in C^1_c(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$, that is such that $Y = 0$ ouside of a compact subset of Ω. Multiply the equation for w_i in (2.10) by $\nabla w_i \cdot Y$ and the one for z_i by $\nabla z_i \cdot Y$. Summing up, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^k l_i \int_\Omega \langle \nabla w_i, \nabla(\nabla w_i \cdot Y)\rangle\, dx + \sum_{i=1}^k m_i \int_\Omega \langle \nabla z_i, \nabla(\nabla z_i \cdot Y)\rangle\, dx \\ - \sum_{i=1}^k \int_\Omega (H_{w_i}(w, z)(\nabla w_i \cdot Y) + H_{z_i}(w, z)(\nabla z_i \cdot Y))\, dx = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \langle \nabla w_i, \nabla(\nabla w_i \cdot Y)\rangle\, dx = &= \int_\Omega \langle \nabla w_i, (H w_i Y + dY^T \nabla w_i)\rangle\, dx \\ &= \int_\Omega (\langle H w_i \nabla w_i, Y\rangle + \langle dY \nabla w_i, \nabla w_i\rangle)\, dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}\nabla(|\nabla w_i|^2) \cdot Y + \langle dY \nabla w_i, \nabla w_i\rangle \right) dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \left(\langle dY \nabla w_i, \nabla w_i\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla w_i|^2 \mathrm{div} Y \right) dx,\end{aligned}$$

where Hw_i denotes the Hessian of w_i. Analogously,

$$\int_\Omega \langle \nabla v_i, \nabla(\nabla v_i \cdot Y)\rangle \, dx = \int_\Omega \left(\langle dY \nabla v_i, \nabla v_i\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla v_i|^2 \mathrm{div} Y \right) dx.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^k \int_\Omega (H_{w_i}(w,z)(\nabla w_i \cdot Y) + H_{z_i}(w,z)(\nabla z_i \cdot Y))\, dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \nabla_x (H(w(x),z(x))) \cdot Y(x)\, dx = -\int_\Omega H(w,z)\mathrm{div} Y \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now let us apply the previous result to (u,v), the limit functions obtained in Theorem 2.11. Recall the definitions

$$a_i = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(u_\beta)) = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a_i}(M(u_\beta)), \qquad b_i = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \xi_{ii}}(M(v_\beta)) = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial a_i}(M(v_\beta)),$$

and

$$\mu_i = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} \mu_{ii,\beta}, \qquad \nu_i = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} \nu_{ii,\beta}.$$

Corollary 2.15. *Let (u,v) be the limit functions given by Theorem 2.11. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \int_\Omega \left(\langle dY \nabla u_i, \nabla u_i\rangle - \frac{1}{2} divY |\nabla u_i|^2 \right) dx \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \int_\Omega \left(\langle dY \nabla v_i, \nabla v_i\rangle - \frac{1}{2} divY |\nabla v_i|^2 \right) dx \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^k \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}(\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, divY \, dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since the functions (u_β, v_β) solve the system (2.3), we can apply the previous result with:

$$H_\beta(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^k (\mu_{ij,\beta} u_i u_j + \nu_{ij,\beta} v_i v_j) + \frac{\beta}{q}\left(\sum_{j=1}^k u_j^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k v_j^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, for each $\beta > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i,\beta} \int_\Omega (\langle dY \nabla u_{i,\beta}, \nabla u_{i,\beta}\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{div} Y |\nabla u_{i,\beta}|^2)\, dx \\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{k} b_{i,\beta} \int_\Omega (\langle dY \nabla v_{i,\beta}, \nabla v_{i,\beta}\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{div} Y |\nabla v_{i,\beta}|^2)\, dx \\
&+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{k} \int_\Omega (\mu_{ij,\beta} u_{i,\beta} u_{j,\beta} + \nu_{ij,\beta} v_{i,\beta} v_{j,\beta}) \mathrm{div} Y\, dx \\
&-\frac{\beta}{q}\int_\Omega \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_{j,\beta}^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} v_{j,\beta}^2\right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \mathrm{div} Y\, dx = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

By using the convergences stated in Theorem 2.11 we can conclude by passing to the limit in (2.11). □

Corollary 2.16 (Local Pohozaev–type identities)**.** *Given $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r \in (0, \mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(2-N)\sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i |\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_i|^2)\, dx \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} a_i r (2(\partial_n u_i)^2 - |\nabla u_i|^2)\, d\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} b_i r (2(\partial_n v_i)^2 - |\nabla v_i|^2)\, d\sigma \\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} r(\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, d\sigma - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} N(\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Given $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ we choose $Y = Y_\delta(x) = (x - x_0)\eta_\delta(x)$ where η_δ is a cut-off function such that $\eta_\delta = 1$ on $B_r(x_0)$, $\eta_\delta(x) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{r+\delta}(x_0)$. Observe that

$$\langle dY_\delta \nabla u_i, \nabla u_i\rangle = \langle d(\eta_\delta(x)(x - x_0))\nabla u_i, \nabla u_i\rangle = \eta_\delta |\nabla u_i|^2 + (\nabla u_i \cdot \nabla \eta_\delta)\langle \nabla u_i, x - x_0\rangle,$$

$$\mathrm{div}(Y_\delta) = N\eta_\delta + \langle \nabla \eta_\delta, x - x_0\rangle.$$

By using Corollary 2.15, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_\Omega \frac{2-N}{2} \eta_\delta (a_i |\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_i|^2)\, dx + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_\Omega \frac{N}{2} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, \eta_\delta\, dx \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla u_i|^2 \langle \nabla \eta_\delta, x - x_0\rangle - (\nabla u_i \cdot \nabla \eta_\delta)\langle \nabla u_i, x - x_0\rangle\right) dx \\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2}|\nabla v_i|^2 \langle \nabla \eta_\delta, x - x_0\rangle - (\nabla v_i \cdot \nabla \eta_\delta)\langle \nabla v_i, x - x_0\rangle\right) dx \\
&-\sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}(\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\langle \nabla \eta_\delta, x - x_0\rangle\, dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

We can rewrite the right-hand-side as

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \int_\Omega |\nabla \eta_\delta| \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_i|^2 \left\langle \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|}, x - x_0 \right\rangle - \left(\nabla u_i \cdot \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|} \right) \langle \nabla u_i, x - x_0 \rangle \right) dx$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \int_\Omega |\nabla \eta_\delta| \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla v_i|^2 \left\langle \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|}, x - x_0 \right\rangle - \left(\nabla v_i \cdot \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|} \right) \langle \nabla v_i, x - x_0 \rangle \right) dx$$
$$- \sum_{i=1}^k \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \eta_\delta| (\mu_i^2 u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2) \left\langle \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|}, x - x_0 \right\rangle dx$$

which, by the co-area formula, is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \int_0^1 \int_{\{\eta_\delta = t\}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_i|^2 \left\langle \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|}, x - x_0 \right\rangle - \left(\nabla u_i \cdot \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|} \right) \langle \nabla u_i, x - x_0 \rangle \right) d\sigma dt$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \int_0^1 \int_{\{\eta_\delta = t\}} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla v_i|^2 \left\langle \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|}, x - x_0 \right\rangle - \left(\nabla v_i \cdot \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|} \right) \langle \nabla v_i, x - x_0 \rangle \right) d\sigma dt$$
$$- \sum_{i=1}^k \int_0^1 \int_{\{\eta_\delta = t\}} \frac{1}{2} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2) \left\langle \frac{\nabla \eta_\delta}{|\nabla \eta_\delta|}, x - x_0 \right\rangle d\sigma dt.$$

Thus, as $\delta \to 0$, (2.12) becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} \frac{2-N}{2} (a_i |\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_i|^2)\, dx + \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} \frac{N}{2} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, dx$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \left((\nabla u_i \cdot \nu) \langle \nabla u_i, x - x_0 \rangle - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u_i|^2 \langle \nu, x - x_0 \rangle \right) d\sigma$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \left((\nabla v_i \cdot \nu) \langle \nabla v_i, x - x_0 \rangle - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla v_i|^2 \langle \nu, x - x_0 \rangle \right) d\sigma$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \frac{1}{2} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2) \langle \nu, x - x_0 \rangle\, d\sigma.$$

As $\nu = \frac{x - x_0}{r}$ on $\partial B_r(x_0)$, the right-hand-side of the previous inequality is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \left(r(\partial_n u_i)^2 - \frac{r}{2} |\nabla u_i|^2 \right) d\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \left(r(\partial_n v_i)^2 - \frac{r}{2} |\nabla v_i|^2 \right) d\sigma$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \frac{r}{2} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, d\sigma$$

and the conclusion follows. □

Ahead we will only need the local Pohozaev identities of Corollary 2.16. We have stated as well the more general ones of Corollary 2.15, as we think they are of independent interest (see for instance [17] for an application).

Under the previous notations, now define the quantities

$$E(x_0,(u,v),r)=\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{B_r(x_0)}\left(a_i|\nabla u_i|^2+b_i|\nabla v_i|^2-\mu_i u_i^2-\nu_i v_i^2\right)\,dx,$$

$$H(x_0,(u,v),r)=\frac{1}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}(a_i u_i^2+b_i v_i^2)\,d\sigma$$

and the Almgren's quotient by

$$N(x_0,(u,v),r)=\frac{E(x_0,(u,v),r)}{H(x_0,(u,v),r)},$$

whenever $H(x_0,(u,v),r)\neq 0$.

Lemma 2.17. *Given $x_0\in\Omega$ and $r\in(0,\operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Omega))$ we have that*

$$\frac{d}{dr}E(x_0,(u,v),r)=\frac{2}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}\left(a_i(\partial_n u_i)^2+b_i(\partial_n v_i)^2\right)\,d\sigma$$
$$-\frac{2}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i u_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,dx.$$

Proof. The derivative of $r\mapsto E(x_0,(u,v),r)$ is given by

$$\frac{2-N}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{B_r(x_0)}(a_i|\nabla u_i|^2+b_i|\nabla v_i|^2)\,dx-\frac{2-N}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i u_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,dx$$
$$+\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}(a_i|\nabla u_i|^2+b_i|\nabla v_i|^2)\,d\sigma-\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i u_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,d\sigma.$$

By using Corollary 2.16, this quantity is equal to

$$\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}a_i(2(\partial_n u_i)^2-|\nabla u_i|^2)\,d\sigma+\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}b_i(2(\partial_n v_i)^2-|\nabla v_i|^2)\,d\sigma$$
$$+\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i u_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,d\sigma-\frac{N}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i u_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,dx$$
$$-\frac{2-N}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i u_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,dx+\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}(a_i|\nabla u_i|^2+b_i|\nabla v_i|^2)\,d\sigma$$
$$-\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i v_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,d\sigma$$

or, equivalently, to

$$\frac{2}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}(a_i(\partial_n u_i)^2+b_i(\partial_n v_i)^2)\,d\sigma-\frac{2}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\int_{B_r(x_0)}(\mu_i u_i^2+\nu_i v_i^2)\,dx.$$

□

Lemma 2.18. *Given $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$ we have*

$$\frac{d}{dr} H(x_0, (u,v), r) = \frac{2}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i u_i (\partial_n u_i) + b_i v_i (\partial_n v_i))\, d\sigma.$$

Proof. After a change of variables,

$$H(x_0, (u,v), r) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_1(0)} (a_i u_i^2(x_0 + rx) + b_i v_i^2(x_0 + rx))\, d\sigma,$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dr} H(x_0, (u,v), r) =& 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_1(0)} a_i u_i(x_0 + rx) \langle \nabla u_i(x_0 + rx), x \rangle\, d\sigma \\ &+ 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_1(0)} b_i v_i(x_0 + rx) \langle \nabla v_i(x_0 + rx), x \rangle\, d\sigma \\ =& \frac{2}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i u_i (\partial_n u_i) + b_i v_i (\partial_n v_i))\, d\sigma.\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we prove an auxiliary technical result.

Lemma 2.19. *There exists $C > 0$ and $\bar{r} > 0$, both depending only on N and $\|u_i\|, \|v_i\|$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, such that*

$$\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, dx \leqslant C r (E(x_0, (u,v), r) + H(x_0, (u,v), r))$$

for every $x_0 \in \Omega$, $r \in (0, \bar{r})$.

Proof. By making $\beta \to +\infty$ in (2.4) we obtain

$$\mu_i = a_i \int_\Omega |\nabla u_i|^2\, dx \leqslant \kappa_1 a_i,$$

with κ_1 depending only on $\|u_1\|, \dots, \|u_k\|$. Thus we have

$$\frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, dx \leqslant \frac{\kappa_1}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i u_i^2 + b_i v_i^2)\, dx$$

$$\leqslant \frac{\kappa_1}{N-1} r \left(\frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i |\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_i|^2)\, dx + \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i u_i^2 + b_i v_i^2)\, d\sigma \right)$$

by the Poincaré inequality. Next we observe that

$$\frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left(a_i |\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_i|^2\right) = E(x_0, (u,v), r) + \frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{B_r(x_0)} (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, dx.$$

Thus for r small enough such that $\frac{\kappa_1}{N-1} r^2 \leqslant 1/2$ the result follows, with $C = \frac{2\kappa_1}{N-1}$. □

Remark 2.20. For later reference, we mention that in the proof of Lemma 2.19 we have established the following result: There exists $\bar r > 0$ depending only on N and $\|u_i\|, \|v_i\|$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i|\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i|\nabla v_i|^2)\, dx + \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i u_i^2 + b_i v_i^2)\, d\sigma \\ \leqslant 2(E(x_0,(u,v),r) + H(x_0,(u,v),r)).\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

for every $x_0 \in \Omega$, $r \in (0, \bar r)$.

We now have all the ingredients to state and prove the monotonicity result.

Theorem 2.21 (Almgren's Monotonicity Formula)**.** *Let $C = C(N, ||u_i||, ||v_i||)$ be given by Lemma 2.19. Then, given $\tilde\Omega \Subset \Omega$, there exists $\tilde r > 0$ such that for every $x_0 \in \tilde\Omega$ and $r \in (0, \tilde r]$ we have $H(x_0,(u,v),r) \neq 0$, $N(x_0,(u,v),\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous function, and*

$$\frac{d}{dr} N(x_0,(u,v),r) \geqslant -2Cr(N(x_0,(u,v),r) + 1).$$

In particular, $e^{Cr^2}(N(x_0,(u,v),r) + 1)$ is a non decreasing function for $r \in (0, \tilde r]$ and the limit $N(x_0,(u,v),0^+) := \lim_{r\to 0^+} N(x_0,(u,v),r)$ exists and is finite. Also,

$$\frac{d}{dr} \log(H(x_0,(u,v),r)) = \frac{2}{r} N(x_0,(u,v),r) \qquad \forall r \in (0, \tilde r).$$

Moreover, the common nodal set

$$\Gamma_{(u,v)} := \{x \in \Omega :\ u_i(x) = v_i(x) = 0 \text{ for every } i = 1, \dots, k\}$$

has no interior points.

Proof. We use the same argument as in [29, Proposition 4.3]. As a starting point, we observe that Theorem 2.11 (iii) implies that

$$E(x_0,(u,v),r) = \frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i u_i(\partial_n u_i) + b_i v_i(\partial_n v_i))\, d\sigma. \tag{2.14}$$

Suppose first that $H(x_0,(u,v),r) > 0$ in some interval. For simplicity of notations, we write $H(r) := H(x_0,(u,v),r)$ and similarly for $E(r)$ and $N(r)$. By combining Lemma 2.18 and (2.14) we find that

$$\frac{d}{dr} \log H(r) = \frac{2}{r} N(r).$$

Also, by using Lemmas 2.17 and 2.18 together with (2.14), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dr} N(r) = \frac{2}{r^{2N-3} H^2(r)} \Bigg[\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i(\partial_n u_i)^2 + b_i(\partial_n v_i)^2) d\sigma \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i u_i^2 + b_i v_i^2) d\sigma \\ - \left(\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i u_i(\partial_n u_i) + b_i v_i(\partial_n v_i))\, d\sigma \right)^2 \Bigg] - \frac{2}{H(r) r^{N-1}} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^k (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, dx.\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, thanks to Lemma 2.19,

$$\frac{d}{dr} N(r) \geqslant -\frac{2}{H(r) r^{N-1}} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \sum_{i=1}^k (\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\, dx \geqslant -2Cr\, \frac{E(r) + H(r)}{H(r)} = -2Cr\,(N(r) + 1).$$

Thus, in order to conclude the proof of Theorem 2.21 we must show that $H(x_0,(u,v),r)$ is indeed positive for small values of r and $x_0 \in \tilde{\Omega}$.

We first prove that $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ has no interior points. Assume the contrary, and let $x_1 \in \Gamma_{(u,v)}$ be such that $d_1 := \operatorname{dist}(x_1, \partial\Gamma_{(u,v)}) > 0$. Thus $H(x_1,(u,v),r) > 0$ for $r \in (d_1, d_1+\varepsilon)$ for some small ε. By what we have done so far, the function $H(r) := H(x_1,(u,v),r)$ satisfies the initial value problem $H'(r) = a(r)H(r)$ for $r \in (d_1, d_1+\varepsilon)$ and $H(d_1) = 0$, with $a(r) = 2N(r)/r$, which is continuous also at the point d_1 by the monotonicity of the map $e^{Cr^2}(N(r)+1)$. Then $H(r) \equiv 0$ for $r \in (d_1, d_1+\varepsilon)$, a contradiction with the definition of d_1. This proves our claim that $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ has empty interior.

Now, suppose $H(x_0,(u,v),r) = 0$ for some $r > 0$ and $x_0 \in \tilde{\Omega}$. This means that $u_i = v_j = 0$ on $\partial B_r(x_0)$ for every i, j. By extending a non zero component of (u,v), say $u_1|_{B_r(x_0)}$ by zero to the whole Ω (such a non zero component exists, as $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ has empty interior), call $\tilde{u}_1$ such an extension, since $-\Delta|\tilde{u}_1| \leqslant \frac{\mu_1}{a_1}|\tilde{u}_1|$ in Ω, we find out that

$$\frac{\mu_1}{a_1}\int_{B_r(x_0)} u_1^2\,dx \geqslant \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u_1|^2 dx \geqslant \lambda_1(B_r(x_0))\int_{B_r(x_0)} u_1^2\,dx.$$

This cannot hold if $r = r(\mu_1, a_1)$ is small enough, uniformly in $x_0 \in \tilde{\Omega}$, and we are done. □

As a consequence of the Almgren's Monotonicity Formula, we have the following.

Corollary 2.22. *Let (u,v) be as before. Then*

1. *given $\tilde{\Omega} \Subset \Omega$ there exist $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\tilde{\Omega}, N, \|u_i\|, \|v_i\|)$ and $\tilde{r} > 0$ such that, for every $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leqslant \tilde{r}$,*
$$H(x,(u,v),r_2) \leqslant H(x,(u,v),r_1)\left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^{2\tilde{C}};$$
2. *the map $\Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $x \mapsto N(x,(u,v),0^+)$ is upper semi-continuous;*
3. *for every $x_0 \in \Gamma_{(u,v)}$ we have $N(x_0,(u,v),0^+) \geqslant 1$.*

Proof. The proof of this result follows word by word the ones of Corollaries 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 in [33]. □

The Almgren's monotonicity formula allows us to improve the regularity result for (u,v) and to give and alternative characterization of the nodal set.

Corollary 2.23. *The functions u and v are Lipschitz continuous.*

Proof. Once Theorem 2.21 and Corollary 2.22 are settled, we can reason exactly as in [29, Proposition 4.1] (see also [32, Subsection 2.4]). □

Corollary 2.24. *If A is a connected component of $\widetilde{\omega}_u$ (respectively $\widetilde{\omega}_v$), then there exists a component u_i such that $A \subseteq \{u_i^2 > 0\}$ (respectively $A \subseteq \{v_i^2 > 0\}$).*

As a consequence, we have $\omega_u = \widetilde{\omega}_u$, $\omega_v = \widetilde{\omega}_v$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{(u,v)} &:= \{x \in \Omega :\ u_i(x) = v_i(x) = 0 \text{ for every } i = 1,\dots,k\}\\ &= \partial\omega_u \cap \Omega = \partial\omega_v \cap \Omega\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Take A a connected component of $\widetilde{\omega}_u$, so that in particular $v_j \equiv 0$ in A for every j. Since all u_i's are eigenfunctions on the set A, and by the minimality provided by Corollary 2.12, then either $u_j \equiv 0$ in A for every j, or $A \subseteq \{u_i^2 > 0\}$ for some i. The first case cannot occur since $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ has an empty interior, and thus the first statement of the corollary is proved. All the other statements now follow in a straightforward way. □

We end this subsection with a more detailed description of the equation satisfied by the functions u_i, v_i in the whole Ω.

Proposition 2.25. *Let (u, v) be the limiting configuration obtained before. Then for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ there exist measures $\mathscr{M}_i$ and $\mathscr{N}_i$, both supported on $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$[3], such that*

$$-a_i\Delta u_i = \mu_i u_i - \mathscr{M}_i, \quad -b_i\Delta v_i = \nu_i v_i - \mathscr{N}_i \qquad \text{in } \mathscr{D}'(\Omega) = (C_c^\infty(\Omega))', \ i = 1, \dots, k. \tag{2.15}$$

Proof. By using Kato's inequality in (2.3), we deduce that

$$-a_{ij,\beta}\Delta|u_{i,\beta}| \leqslant \sum_{j=1}^k |\mu_{ij,\beta}||u_{j,\beta}| - \beta|u_{i,\beta}|\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Integrating over Ω, we deduce that

$$\int_\Omega \beta|u_{i,\beta}|\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}\,dx \leqslant \int_{\partial\Omega} a_{i,\beta}\partial_n|u_{i,\beta}|\,d\sigma + \sum_{j=1}^k\int_\Omega |\mu_{ij,\beta}||u_{j,\beta}|\,dx \leqslant C,$$

where we have used the fact that $\partial_n|u_{i,\beta}| \leqslant 0$, and C depends only on the uniform bounds of $\|u_{i,\beta}\|, \|v_{i,\beta}\|$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Thus $\beta u_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}$ is bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$ independently of β, whence there exists $\mathscr{M}_i \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega) = (C_0(\Omega))'$, a Radon measure, such that

$$\beta u_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}} \rightharpoonup \mathscr{M}_i \qquad \text{weak} - * \text{ in } \mathcal{M}(\Omega).$$

Reasoning in the same manner with the equation for $v_{i,\beta}$, we obtain the existence of $\mathscr{N}_i$ such that

$$\beta v_{i,\beta}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k v_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^k u_{j,\beta}^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}} \rightharpoonup \mathscr{N}_i \qquad \text{weak} - * \text{ in } \mathcal{M}(\Omega).$$

Thus by Theorem 2.11 we conclude that (2.15) holds; we recall that, thanks to (2.4), we have that $\mu_{ij,\beta} \to 0$, $\nu_{ij,\beta} \to 0$ for $i \neq j$.

Let $x_0 \in \Omega \setminus \Gamma_{(u,v)}$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that either $B_\delta(x_0) \subseteq \omega_u$ or $B_\delta(x_0) \subseteq \omega_v$ and the hence the measures are concentrated on $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$.

□

3. Regularity of the nodal set of the approximated solution

Along this section, (u, v) will always denote the limiting function obtained in Theorem 2.11. Our aim is to prove a regularity result for the common nodal set $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$, completing the proof of Theorem 1.6. Although with different proofs, initially we follow the structure of [12, 33]: first we make a detailed study of blowup sequences, and afterwards we use the Almgren's quotient to split the nodal set $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ and give a first characterization of its regular part. On this subset, locally we prove that locally Ω is a Reifenberg flat and NTA domain, and that Γ separates exactly two different connected components of the partition. Finally through an iterative procedure we construct the normal vector to $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$, proving an extremality condition and a non degeneracy property.

[3]That is, $\mathscr{M}_i(A) = \mathscr{M}_i(A \cap \Gamma_{(u,v)})$ and $\mathscr{N}_i(A) = \mathscr{N}_i(A \cap \Gamma_{(u,v)})$ for each measurable set A.

3.1. **Compactness of blowup sequences.** In order to understand the local behavior of the functions (u,v) around any given point, let us study the behavior of blowup sequences. To that purpose, let $\tilde\Omega \Subset \Omega$ and take some sequences $x_n \in \tilde\Omega$, $t_n \to 0^+$. We define a blowup sequence by

$$u_{i,n}(x) := \frac{u_i(x_n + t_n x)}{\rho_n}, \quad v_{i,n}(x) = \frac{v_i(x_n + t_n x)}{\rho_n} \qquad \forall\ x \in \Omega_n := \frac{\Omega - x_n}{t_n},$$

where we have normalized using the quantity

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_n^2 = H(x_n,(u,v),t_n) &= \frac{1}{t_n^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_{t_n}(x_n)} (a_i u_i^2 + b_i v_i^2)\, d\sigma \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \Big(a_i \|u_i(x_n + t_n\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))} + b_i \|v_i(x_n + t_n\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))} \Big).\end{aligned}$$

We observe that

$$H(0,(u_n,v_n),R) = H(x_n,(u,v),t_nR)\rho_n^{-2} \quad \forall R>0, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \Big(a_i \|u_{i,n}\|^2_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))} + b_i \|v_{i,n}\|^2_{L^2(\partial B_1(0))} \Big) = 1 \tag{3.2}$$

and, for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $r>0$ (cf. Theorem 2.11 (iii))

$$a_i \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u_{i,n}|^2\, dx = a_i \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} u_{i,n}\, \partial_n u_{i,n}\, d\sigma + t_n^2 \mu_i \int_{B_r(x_0)} u_{i,n}^2\, dx, \tag{3.3}$$

$$b_i \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2\, dx = b_i \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} v_{i,n}\, \partial_n v_{i,n}\, d\sigma + t_n^2 \nu_i \int_{B_r(x_0)} v_{i,n}^2\, dx. \tag{3.4}$$

It is clear that

$$-a_i\Delta u_{i,n} = t_n^2 \mu_i u_{i,n} - \mathscr{M}_{i,n}, \qquad -b_i \Delta v_{i,n} = t_n^2 \nu_i v_{i,n} - \mathscr{N}_{i,n} \qquad \text{in } \mathscr{D}'(\Omega_n),$$

where $\mathscr{M}_{i,n}$ and $\mathscr{N}_{i,n}$ are measures defined by

$$\mathscr{M}_{i,n}(A) = \frac{1}{\rho_n t_n^{N-2}} \mathscr{M}_i(x_n + t_n A), \qquad \mathscr{N}_{i,n}(A) = \frac{1}{\rho_n t_n^{N-2}} \mathscr{N}_i(x_n + t_n A)$$

for every measurable set $A \subseteq \Omega_n$.

Theorem 3.1. *Under the previous notations there exists $(\bar u, \bar v) \not\equiv (0,0)$ such that $\bar u_i \cdot \bar v_j \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ $\forall i,j$ and, up to a subsequence,*

$$(u_n, v_n) \to (\bar u, \bar v) \quad \text{ in } C^{0,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{ for all } 0<\alpha<1, \text{ strongly in } H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Moreover, there exist $\bar{\mathscr{M}}_i, \bar{\mathscr{N}}_i \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, both concentrated on the set

$$\Gamma_{(\bar u,\bar v)} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N :\ \bar u_i(x) = \bar v_i(x) = 0,\ i = 1,\dots,k\},$$

such that

$$\mathscr{M}_{i,n} \rightharpoonup \bar{\mathscr{M}}_i, \quad \mathscr{N}_{i,n} \rightharpoonup \bar{\mathscr{N}}_i \quad \text{ weakly in } \mathcal{M}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

and

$$-a_i\Delta \bar u_i = -\bar{\mathscr{M}}_i, \quad -b_i\Delta \bar v_i = -\bar{\mathscr{N}}_i \quad \text{ in } \mathscr{D}'(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

In particular,

$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla \bar u_i|^2\,dx = \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \bar u_i\,\partial_n \bar u_i\,d\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla \bar v_i|^2\,dx = \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \bar v_i\,\partial_n \bar v_i\,d\sigma. \tag{3.5}$$

Finally, for each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}(2-N)\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i|\nabla \bar u_i|^2 + b_i|\nabla \bar v_i|^2)\,dx = &\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} a_i r(2(\partial_n \bar u_i)^2 - |\nabla \bar u_i|^2)\,d\sigma \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} b_i r(2(\partial_n \bar v_i)^2 - |\nabla \bar v_i|^2)\,d\sigma.\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

In order to prove Theorem 3.1 we will need to prove first a technical result. Define

$$\Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)} := \{x \in \Omega_n : u_{i,n}(x) = 0 = v_{i,n}(x) \quad \forall i = 1,\dots,k\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\tilde r$ be given by Theorem 2.21. Given $R > 0$ then, for n sufficiently large,*

$$H(x,(u_n,v_n),r) \leqslant Cr^2 \qquad \forall 0 < r < \tilde r/2,\ x \in B_{2R}(0) \cap \Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)},$$

with $C = C(\tilde\Omega, N, \|u_i\|, \|v_i\|)$.

Proof. As long as we have $r < \tilde r$, $t_n < 1$ and $x_n + t_n x \in \tilde\Omega$, we have that

$$\rho_n^2 H(x,(u_n,v_n),r) = H(x_n + t_n x, (u,v), rt_n)$$

and so (cf. Theorem 2.21)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dr}\log\frac{\rho_n^2 H(x,(u_n,v_n),r)}{r^2} &= t_n \frac{d}{dr}\left[\log H(x_n + t_n x,(u,v),\cdot)\right]|_{r=t_n x} - \frac{2}{r} \\ &= \frac{2}{r}(N(x_n + t_n x,(u,v),rt_n) - 1),\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

implying that

$$\frac{r}{2}\frac{d}{dr}\log\frac{\rho_n^2 H(x,(u_n,v_n),r)}{r^2} = (N(x_n + t_n x,(u,v),rt_n)+1)e^{C(rt_n)^2}e^{-C(rt_n)^2} - 2.$$

Now, applying Theorem 2.21,

$$(N(x_n + t_n x,(u,v),rt_n)+1)e^{C(t_n r)^2} \geqslant N(x_n + t_n x,(u,v),0^+) + 1.$$

But since, by assumption, $x_n + t_n x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)}$, it follows from Corollary 2.22 that

$$(N(x_n + t_n x,(u,v),rt_n)+1)e^{C(rt_n)^2} \geqslant 2.$$

Going back to (3.7), we conclude that

$$\frac{d}{dr}\log\frac{\rho_n^2 H(x,(u_n,v_n),r)}{r^2} \geqslant \frac{4}{r}(e^{-C(rt_n)^2} - 1) \geqslant \frac{4}{r}(e^{-C'r^2} - 1) \qquad \forall 0 < r < \tilde r.$$

This implies, after an integration, that, for every $0 < r < \bar r < \tilde r$,

$$\frac{H(x,(u_n,v_n),r)}{r^2} \leqslant \frac{H(x,(u_n,v_n),\bar r)}{\bar r^2}\exp\Big(\int_r^{\bar r}\frac{4}{s}(1 - e^{-C's^2})\,ds\Big) \leqslant C(\bar r) < \infty,$$

thus proving the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We follow the argument in the proof of [33, Theorem 3.3].

Step 1. We first prove that given $R > 1$ then, for n sufficiently large,

$$\|(u_n, v_n)\|_{H_0^1(B_R(0))} \leqslant C.$$

Indeed, if n is so large that $t_n R \leqslant \tilde{r}$ (cf. Theorem 2.21) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_R(0)} (a_i u_{i,n}^2 + b_i v_{i,n}^2)\, d\sigma &= \frac{1}{\rho_n^2 t_n^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_{t_n R}(x_n)} (a_i u_i^2 + b_i v_i^2)\, d\sigma \\ &= R^{N-1} \frac{H(x_n, (u,v), t_n R)}{H(x_n, (u,v), t_n)} \leqslant R^{N-1} R^{2\tilde{C}}\end{aligned}$$

(cf. Corollary 2.22), yielding that

$$H(0, (u_n, v_n), R) \leqslant C(R).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{R^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_R(0)} (a_i |\nabla u_{i,n}|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2)\, dx \\ &\quad \leqslant \frac{C(R)}{H(0, (u_n, v_n), R)} \frac{1}{R^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_R(0)} (a_i |\nabla u_{i,n}|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2)\, dx \\ &\quad = \frac{C(R)}{H(0, (u_n, v_n), R)} \left(\frac{1}{R^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_R(0)} (a_i |\nabla u_{i,n}|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2)\, dx \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \frac{1}{R^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_R(0)} (a_i u_{i,n}^2 + b_i v_{i,n}^2)\, d\sigma \right) - C(R) \\ &\quad = \frac{C(R)\rho_n^{-2}}{H(0, (u_n, v_n), R)} \left(\frac{1}{(t_n R)^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_{t_n R}(x_n)} (a_i |\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_i|^2)\, dx \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \frac{1}{(t_n R)^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_{t_n R}(x_n)} (a_i u_i^2 + b_i v_i^2)\, d\sigma \right) - C(R) \\ &\quad \leqslant \frac{2C(R)\rho_n^{-2}}{H(0, (u_n, v_n), R)} \Big(E(x_n, (u,v), t_n R) + H(x_n, (u,v), t_n R) \Big) - C(R)\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.13) in the last inequality. By taking (3.1) into account, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{R^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_R(0)} (a_i |\nabla u_{i,n}|^2 + b_i |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2)\, dx \\ &\quad \leqslant \frac{2C(R)}{H(x_n, (u,v), t_n R)} \Big(E(x_n, (u,v), t_n R) + H(x_n, (u,v), t_n R) \Big) - C(R) \\ &\quad = 2C(R)(N(x_n, (u,v), t_n R) + 1) - C(R) \\ &\quad \leqslant 2C(R)(N(x_n, (u,v), t_n R) + 1) e^{\tilde{C}(t_n R)^2} - C(R) \\ &\quad \leqslant 2C(R)(N(x_n, (u,v), \tilde{r}) + 1) e^{\tilde{C}\tilde{r}^2} - C(R) \leqslant C'(R),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Theorem 2.21 in the last inequality. The new constant $C'(R)$ depends on $\sup_{y\in\tilde\Omega}|N(y,(u,v),\tilde r)|<\infty$.

Step 2. We next show that given $R>0$ then, for n sufficiently large,

$$\|(u_n,v_n)\|_{L^\infty(B_R(0))}\leqslant C'.$$

Indeed, it follows from (3.8) that, by letting $U_n=\sum_{i=1}^k|u_{i,n}|$, then $-\Delta U_n\leqslant CU_n$. This, together with the estimate in Step 1 and a standard Brezis-Kato bootstrap argument, proves our claim for $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(B_R(0))}$ and for $\|v_n\|_{L^\infty(B_R(0))}$ as well.

Step 3. We next prove that given $R>0$ the measures $\mathscr{M}_{i,n}$ and $\mathscr{N}_{i,n}$ are bounded in $\mathcal{M}(B_R(0))$. Take positive measures $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{i,n}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{N}_{i,n}}$ satisfying

$$-a_i\Delta|u_{i,n}|\leqslant t_n^2|\mu_i|\,|u_{i,n}|-\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{i,n}},\qquad -b_i\Delta|v_{i,n}|\leqslant t_n^2|\nu_i|\,|v_{i,n}|-\widetilde{\mathscr{N}_{i,n}}\qquad\text{in }\mathscr{D}'(\Omega_n)\tag{3.8}$$

and

$$|\mathscr{M}_{i,n}|\leqslant\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{i,n}},\qquad|\mathscr{N}_{i,n}|\leqslant\widetilde{\mathscr{N}_{i,n}}.\tag{3.9}$$

Multiply the first equation in (3.8) by a smooth cut-off function φ such that $0\leqslant\varphi\leqslant1$, $\varphi=1$ in $B_R(0)$ and $\varphi=0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_{2R}(0)$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{i,n}}\|_{\mathcal{M}(B_R(0))}&=\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{i,n}}(B_R(0))\leqslant\int_{B_{2R}(0)}\varphi\,d\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{i,n}}\\&\leqslant-a_i\int_{B_{2R}(0)}\langle\nabla|u_{i,n}|,\nabla\varphi\rangle\,dx+t_n^2|\mu_i|\int_{B_{2R}(0)}|u_{i,n}|\,\varphi dx.\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the conclusion in Step 1, we deduce that $(\|\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{i,n}}\|_{\mathcal{M}(B_R(0))})_n$ is a bounded sequence. It follows then from (3.9) that also $(\|\mathscr{M}_{i,n}\|_{\mathcal{M}(B_R(0))})_n$ is bounded. A similar conclusion holds for $(\|\widetilde{\mathscr{N}_{i,n}}\|_{\mathcal{M}(B_R(0))})_n$ and $(\|\mathscr{N}_{i,n}\|_{\mathcal{M}(B_R(0))})_n$.

Step 4. We now turn to the proof of a Lipschitz estimate. Namely, we prove that, given $R>0$ then, for n sufficiently large,

$$\|(u_n,v_n)\|_{C^{0,1}(B_R(0))}\leqslant C''.$$

To this aim, suppose without loss of generality, that

$$\begin{aligned}[(u_n,v_n)]_{C^{0,1}(B_R(0))}&=\max_{i=1,\dots,k}\left\{\sup_{\substack{x,y\in B_R(0)\\x\neq y}}\frac{|u_{i,n}(x)-u_{i,n}(y)|}{|x-y|},\sup_{\substack{x,y\in B_R(0)\\x\neq y}}\frac{|v_{i,n}(x)-v_{i,n}(y)|}{|x-y|}\right\}\\&=\frac{|u_{1,n}(y_n)-u_{1,n}(z_n)|}{|y_n-z_n|},\end{aligned}$$

with $|y_n|\leqslant R$, $|z_n|\leqslant R$. Let

$$r_n:=|y_n-z_n|,\qquad 2R_n:=\max\{\operatorname{dist}(y_n,\Gamma_{u_n}),\operatorname{dist}(z_n,\Gamma_{u_n})\}=\operatorname{dist}(z_n,\Gamma_{u_n}),$$

where we have denoted

$$\Gamma_{u_n}:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^N:u_{i,n}(x)=0\quad\forall i=1,\dots,k\}.$$

In view of proving our claim, we may already assume that $R_n>0$ and, thanks to Step 2, that $r_n\to0$. Moreover, since $-a_1\Delta u_{1,n}=t_n^2\mu_1u_{1,n}$ in $\Omega_n\setminus\Gamma_{u_n}$, the desired conclusion follows

easily from standard elliptic estimates in case $\liminf_n R_n > 0$. In conclusion, we may already assume that

$$r_n \to 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 0 < R_n \to 0.$$

A crucial remark in our subsequent argument is the observation that

$$d(z_n, \Gamma_{u_n}) = d(z_n, \Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)}), \tag{3.10}$$

where we recall the definition

$$\Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : u_{i,n}(x) = 0 = v_{i,n}(x) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

This, of course, is a consequence of the fact that $\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k u_{i,n}^2\Big)\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k v_{i,n}^2\Big) \equiv 0$ and $R_n > 0$.

Case 4a. Suppose first that $(R_n/r_n)_n$ is a bounded sequence. By letting $U_n := \sum_{i=1}^k u_{i,n}^2$ we have $-\Delta U_n \leqslant 2Ct_n^2 U_n$ in Ω_n. By applying [33, Lemma 3.9] to this inequality we get that

$$\begin{aligned} U_n(z_n) &\leqslant \frac{1}{|B_{R_n}(z_n)|}\int_{B_{R_n}(z_n)} U_n(x)\,dx + \frac{Ct_n^2R_n^2}{2(N+2)}\|U_n\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_n}(z_n))} \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{|B_{R_n}(z_n)|}\int_{B_{R_n}(z_n)} U_n(x)\,dx + C'R_n^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Now, thanks to (3.10) we can choose $w_n \in \Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)} \cap B_{2R}(0)$ in such a way that

$$d(z_n, \Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)}) = |z_n - w_n| = d(z_n, \Gamma_n) = 2R_n.$$

It follows then from Lemma 3.2 that, for large n and small r,

$$H(w_n, (u_n, v_n), r) \leqslant Cr^2.$$

In particular, we have

$$\frac{1}{r^{N-1}}\int_{\partial B_r(w_n)} U_n(\sigma)\,d\sigma \leqslant C'r^2,$$

thus also

$$\frac{1}{r^N}\int_{B_r(w_n)} U_n(x)\,dx \leqslant C''r^2.$$

Since $R_n \to 0$, we get from (3.11) that $U_n(z_n) \leqslant C'''R_n^2$. In particular, since by assumption the sequence $(R_n/r_n)_n$ is bounded,

$$u_{1,n}^2(z_n) \leqslant Cr_n^2,$$

with C independent of n. This proves our desired estimate

$$|u_{1,n}(z_n) - u_{1,n}(y_n)|^2 \leqslant C|y_n - z_n|^2 = Cr_n^2 \tag{3.12}$$

at least in the case where $u_{1,n}(y_n) = 0$. But in case $u_{1,n}(y_n) \neq 0$ we have

$$0 < d(y_n, \Gamma_n) \leqslant d(z_n, \Gamma_n) = 2R_n \to 0,$$

and we get as above that $u_{1,n}^2(y_n) \leqslant Cd(y_n, \Gamma_n)^2 \leqslant C'r_n^2$, leading still to (3.12).

Case 4b. Suppose secondly that $r_n/R_n \to 0$. By applying elliptic estimates to the equation $-a_1\Delta u_{1,n} = t_n^2\mu_1 u_{1,n}$ together with the bound in Step 2 we get that

$$\|u_{1,n}\|_{C^{0,1}(B_{R_n/2}(z_n))} \leqslant C(R_n^{-1}\|u_{1,n}\|_{L^\infty(B_{R_n}(z_n))} + 1). \tag{3.13}$$

Arguing as in Case 1 above we prove the existence of $C > 0$ such that for large n and every $x \in B_{R_n}(z_n)$ it holds $u_{1,n}^2(x) \leqslant Cd(x, \Gamma_n)^2 \leqslant C'R_n^2$. By (3.13) we deduce that the

sequence $\|u_{1,n}\|_{C^{0,1}(B_{R_n/2}(z_n))}$ is bounded. Since by assumption $y_n \in B_{R_n/2}(z_n)$ for large n, this completes the argument if Case 2 holds and finishes the proof of the estimates in Step 4.

Step 5. By what we have proved so far, by taking subsequences we can find

$$(u_n, v_n) \to (\bar u, \bar v) \quad \text{ in } C^{0,\alpha}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{ for all } 0<\alpha<1, \text{ weakly in } H^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

as well as measures $\bar{\mathscr{M}}_i$, $\bar{\mathscr{N}}_i$, with the properties stated in Theorem 3.1. The normalization property (3.2) implies that $(\bar u, \bar v) \not\equiv (0,0)$, while the fact that $\bar{\mathscr{M}}_i$ and $\bar{\mathscr{N}}_i$ are concentrated on $\tilde\Gamma_{(\bar u,\bar v)}$ follows from the convergence $(u_n, v_n) \to (\bar u, \bar v)$ in $L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Next we show that

$$(u_n, v_n) \to (\bar u, \bar v) \quad \text{ in strongly in } H^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

To show this, we multiply the equation $-a_i\Delta(u_{i,n}-\bar u_i) = t_n^2\mu_1 u_{i,n} + \bar{\mathscr{M}}_i - \mathscr{M}_{i,n}$ by $(u_{i,n}-\bar u_i)\varphi$, where a smooth cut-off function φ such that $0 \leqslant \varphi \leqslant 1$, $\varphi = 1$ in $B_R(0)$ and $\varphi = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{2R}(0)$. Since

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_{i,n}-\bar u_i)\varphi\, d\mathscr{M}_{i,n}\right| \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u_{i,n}-\bar u_i|\varphi\, d|\mathscr{M}_{i,n}| \leqslant \|u_{i,n}-\bar u_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{2R}(0))}|\mathscr{M}_{i,n}|(B_{2R}(0))$$

and similarly for $|\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u_{i,n}-\bar u_i)\varphi\, d\mathscr{M}_i|$, we get that $a_i\int_{B_R(0)}|\nabla(u_{i,n}-\bar u_i)|^2\,dx \to 0$, and the conclusion follows. In particular, we obtain (3.5) by passing to the limit in (3.3) and in (3.4).

Step 6. Let us now check (3.6). From Corollary 2.16 we deduce, by taking suitable rescailings, that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(2-N)\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i|\nabla u_{i,n}|^2 + b_i|\nabla v_{i,n}|^2)\,dx \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} a_i r(2(\partial_n u_{i,n})^2 - |\nabla u_{i,n}|^2)\,d\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} b_i r(2(\partial_n v_{i,n})^2 - |\nabla v_{i,n}|^2)\,d\sigma \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} r t_n^2(\mu_i u_{i,n}^2 + \nu_i v_{i,n}^2)\,d\sigma - \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} N t_n^2(\mu_i u_{i,n}^2 + \nu_i v_{i,n}^2)\,dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Then (3.6) follows by letting $n \to \infty$ in this identity. □

Having established a strong convergence result for any blowup sequence, based on the properties of (u, v) we can characterize in a better way the possible blowup limits. First we observe that the Almgren's monotonicity formula valid from (u, v) is transported to any limit $(\bar u, \bar v)$.

Corollary 3.3 (Almgren's formula for $(\bar u, \bar v)$)**.** *For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $r > 0$, let*

$$E(x_0, (\bar u, \bar v), r) = \frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i|\nabla \bar u_i|^2 + b_i|\nabla \bar v_i|^2)\,dx,$$

$$H(x_0, (\bar u, \bar v), r) = \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i \bar u_i^2 + b_i \bar v_i^2)\,d\sigma,$$

and define the Almgren's quotient by

$$N(x_0, (\bar u, \bar v), r) = \frac{E(x_0, (\bar u, \bar v), r)}{H(x_0, (\bar u, \bar v), r)}.$$

Then $H(x_0,(\bar u,\bar v),r)\neq 0$ for every $r>0$, $r\mapsto N(x_0,(\bar u,\bar v),r)$ is a nondecreasing map, and

$$\frac{d}{dr}\log(H(x_0,(\bar u,\bar v),r)) = \frac{2}{r}N(x_0,(\bar u,\bar v),r). \tag{3.14}$$

In particular, the set

$$\Gamma_{(\bar u,\bar v)} = \{x\in\mathbb{R}^N :\ \bar u_i(x)=\bar v_i(x)=0 \text{ for every } i=1,\dots,k\}$$

has no interior points.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one in Theorem 2.21. We provide the full details. We simplify the notations by writing $E(r)=E(x_0,(\bar u,\bar v),r)$ and similarly for $H(r)$ and $N(r)$. At first, thanks to (3.5) we see that

$$E(r) = \frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i\bar u_i\,\partial_n\bar u_i + b_i\bar v_i\,\partial_n\bar v_i)\,d\sigma \tag{3.15}$$

On the other hand, by a simple computation similar to the the one in Lemma 2.18,

$$H'(r) = \frac{2}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i\bar u_i\,\partial_n\bar u_i + b_i\bar v_i\,\partial_n\bar v_i)\,d\sigma$$

and, as in Lemma 2.17, the derivative $E'(r)=\frac{d}{dr}E(x_0,(\bar u,\bar v),r)$ is given by

$$\frac{2-N}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_i|\nabla\bar u_i|^2 + b_i|\nabla\bar v_i|^2)\,dx + \frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i|\nabla\bar u_i|^2 + b_i|\nabla\bar v_i|^2)\,d\sigma$$

that is, thanks to (3.6)

$$E'(r) = \frac{2}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \left(a_i(\partial_n\bar u_i)^2 + b_i(\partial_n\bar v_i)^2\right)\,d\sigma. \tag{3.16}$$

By putting together (3.15) to (3.16) we get that, as long as $H(r)>0$,

$$(\log H)'(r) = \frac{2}{r}N(r) \tag{3.17}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}H^2(r)r^{2N-3}N'(r) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i(\partial_n\bar u_i)^2 + b_i(\partial_n\bar v_i)^2)\,d\sigma \\ &\quad\times\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i\bar u_i^2 + b_i\bar v_i^2)\,d\sigma - \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (a_i\bar u_i\partial_n\bar u_i + b_i\bar v_i\partial_n\bar v_i)\,d\sigma\right)^2 \geqslant 0,\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Now, arguing precisely as in Theorem 2.21, (3.17) together with the monotonicity of the map $N(r)$ implies that $\Gamma_{(\bar u,\bar v)}$ has empty interior. In particular, thanks also to (3.5), we must have that $H(r)>0$ for every $r>0$. □

We now introduce a very important definition, which will help us in the future to lighten the notation.

Definition 3.4. Given $y \in \Omega$, we define the set of all possible blowup limits at y by

$$\mathcal{BU}_y = \left\{ (\bar u, \bar v) : \begin{array}{c} \exists\, x_n \to x_0,\ t_n \to 0 \text{ such that, for every } i, \\ u_{i,n} := \dfrac{u_i(x_n + t_n \cdot)}{\sqrt{H(x_n,(u,v),t_n)}} \to \bar u \ \text{ and } \ v_{i,n} := \dfrac{v_i(x_n + t_n \cdot)}{\sqrt{H(x_n,(u,v),t_n)}} \to \bar v \\ \text{strongly in } H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C^{0,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N),\ \forall 0 < \alpha < 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

From now on we will talk about the associated sequences x_n, t_n defined for each $(\bar u, \bar v) \in \mathcal{BU}_y$, with obvious meaning. Observe that at this point we cannot say that the blowup limit is unique, and it could a priori depend on the chosen sequences. Particular choices of the sequence $(x_n)_n$ provide additional information on the limit $(\bar u, \bar v)$, as a consequence of the Almgren's Formula.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $(\bar u, \bar v) \in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$ with associated sequences x_n, t_n. Assume that one of the following conditions hold:*

1. *$(x_n)_n$ is a constant sequence, i.e. $x_n = x_0$ for every n;*
2. *$(x_n)_n \subseteq \Gamma_{(u,v)}$, and $x_0 \in \Gamma_{(u,v)}$ is such that $N(x_0,(u,v),0^+) = 1$.*

Then $N(0,(\bar u,\bar v),r) \equiv N(x_0,(u,v),0^+) =: \alpha$ for every $r > 0$, and there exist $g_i, h_i : S^{N-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\bar u_i = r^\alpha g_i(\theta), \qquad \bar v_i = r^\alpha h_i(\theta),$$

where $r = |x|$, $\theta = x/|x|$.

Proof. The proof that $N(r) := N(0,(\bar u,\bar v),r)$ has constant value equal to $\alpha = N(x_0,(u,v),0^+)$ follows exactly as in [33, Corollary 3.12], on the ground of Theorem 2.21, Corollary 2.22, and the fact that $N(0,(u_n,v_n),r) = N(x_n,(u,v),t_n r)$. In this situation we have $N'(r) \equiv 0$ and from (3.18) we know that, for a.e. $r > 0$ there exists $C(r) > 0$ such that

$$(\partial_n \bar u_1, \dots, \partial_n \bar u_k, \partial_n \bar v_1, \dots, \partial_n \bar v_k) = C(r)(\bar u_1, \dots, \bar u_k, \bar v_1, \dots, \bar v_k) \qquad \text{on } \partial B_r(0).$$

By inserting this information in (3.14) we get that

$$\frac{2}{r}\alpha = \frac{H'(r)}{H(r)} = \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(0)} (a_i \bar u_i(\partial_n \bar u_i) + b_i \bar v_i(\partial_n \bar v_i))\, d\sigma}{\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(0)} (a_i \bar u_i^2 + b_i \bar v_i^2)\, d\sigma} = 2C(r)$$

and $C(r) = \alpha/r$. As on $\partial B_r(0)$ the normal derivative corresponds to the derivative with respect to the radius, the conclusion follows. □

3.2. **Hausdorff dimension estimates for the nodal and singular sets. Definition of $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, the regular part of the nodal set.** In this subsection we provide upper estimates for the Hausdorff dimension of the nodal set as well as for some of its subsets. Recall from Corollary 2.22 that $N(x,(u,v),0^+) \geqslant 1$ whenever $x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)}$.

Definition 3.6. Let (u,v) be the limit given by Theorem 2.11. We split the nodal set $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ into the following two sets:

$$\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)} = \{x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} :\ N(x,(u,v),0^+) = 1\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{(u,v)} = \Gamma_{(u,v)} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)} = \{x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} :\ N(x,(u,v),0^+) > 1\}.$$

We will prove in the subsequent subsections that $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ turns out to be the regular part of the nodal set, being of class $C^{1,\alpha}$ for some $0<\alpha<1$, whereas the singular part $\mathcal{S}_{(u,v)}$ has small Hausdorff measure: more precisely at most $N-2$. In the spirit of [12, Lemma 4.1] or [33, Lemma 6.1], we prove a jump condition for the value of the map $x\in\Gamma_{(u,v)}\mapsto N(x,(u,v),0^+)$, which will yield in particular that $\mathcal{S}_{(u,v)}$ is relatively close in $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$. Here, the fact that we have groups of components, which eventually change sign, makes the proof more delicate.

Proposition 3.7. *Let (u,v) be the limit given by Theorem 2.11. Then there exists $\delta_N>0$ (depending only on the dimension) such that, for every $x_0\in\Gamma_{(u,v)}$, either*

$$N(x_0,(u,v),0^+)=1 \quad \text{or} \quad N(x_0,(u,v),0^+)\geqslant 1+\delta_N$$

Proof. Consider a blowup sequence at a fixed center $x_0\in\Gamma_{(u,v)}$:

$$u_{i,n}(x)=\frac{u_i(x_0+t_nx)}{\rho_n},\qquad v_{i,n}(x)=\frac{v_i(x_0+t_nx)}{\rho_n},$$

where $\rho_n^2=H(x_0,(u,v),t_n)$ and $t_n\downarrow 0$. By Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.5 (case 1) we have convergence (up to a subsequence) to a limiting configuration $(\bar u,\bar v)$, where

$$\bar u_i=r^\alpha g_i(\theta),\quad \bar v_i=r^\alpha h_i(\theta),\qquad \text{with } \alpha=N(x_0,(u,v),0^+).$$

Moreover, these functions are harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Gamma_{(\bar u,\bar v)}$, whence

$$-\Delta_{S^{N-1}}g_i=\lambda g_i \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta_{S^{N-1}}h_i=\lambda h_i \qquad \text{in } \partial B_1(0)\setminus\Gamma_{(\bar u,\bar v)},$$

$\lambda=\alpha(\alpha+N-2)$. In particular, if A is a connected component of either $\partial B_1(0)\cap\{u_i\neq 0\}$ or $\partial B_1(0)\cap\{v_i\neq 0\}$ for some i, then we have $\lambda=\lambda_1(A)$, the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta_{S^{N-1}}$ in $H^1_0(A)$. We now split the proof in two cases:

Case 1: We have $\bar u_i\not\equiv 0$ and $\bar v_j\not\equiv 0$ for some i,j.

Without loss of generality, suppose that for $1\leqslant l,m\leqslant k$ we have

$$\bar u_1,\dots,\bar u_l\not\equiv 0,\qquad \bar v_1,\dots,\bar v_m\not\equiv 0,$$

and that all the remaining components are 0.

Subcase 1.1. Suppose that for one component, say u_1, the set $\{u_1\neq 0\}$ has at least two connected components: A_1 and A_2. Let B be a connected component of $\{v_1\neq 0\}$. As $u_i\cdot v_j\equiv 0$, the sets A_1,A_2 and B are disjoint, and thus there exists $C\in\{A_1\cap\partial B_1(0),A_2\cap\partial B_1(0),B\cap\partial B_1(0)\}$ such that

$$\mathscr{H}^{N-1}(C)\leqslant\mathscr{H}^{N-1}(\partial B_1(0))/3.$$

Whence

$$\lambda=\lambda_1(C)\geqslant\lambda_1(E(\pi/3))=\lambda_1(\{x\in\partial B_1(0):\ \arccos(\langle x,(0,\dots,0,1)\rangle<\pi/3)\}).$$

Since $E(\pi/2)$ (the half-sphere) has first eigenvalue equal to $N-1$, we obtain the existence of $\gamma>0$ such that $\lambda_1(E(\pi/3))=N-1+\gamma$, and

$$\alpha=\sqrt{\left(\frac{N-2}{2}\right)^2+\lambda}-\frac{N-2}{2}\geqslant 1+\delta_N\qquad\text{for some }\delta_N>0.$$

Subcase 1.2. Suppose that the sets $\{u_i\neq 0\}$, $\{v_i\neq 0\}$ have at most one connected component. Then each nontrivial component is signed, and to fix ideas we can suppose that the nontrivial components are

$$\bar u_1,\dots,\bar u_l\geqslant 0,\qquad\text{and}\qquad \bar v_1,\dots,\bar v_m\geqslant 0.$$

If there exists i, j such that $\{u_i > 0\} \cap \{u_j > 0\} = \emptyset$ (or the same for v), then we can argue exactly as in Subcase 1.1 and get $\alpha \geqslant 1 + \delta_N$. Thus, in the remaining case, $\{u_i > 0\} \cap \{u_j > 0\} \neq \emptyset$ for every $i, j = 1, \dots, l$. Since each component u_i is harmonic in $\cup_j \{u_j > 0\}$, by the maximum principle we must have $\{u_j > 0\} = \{u_1 > 0\}$. Analogously, $\{v_i > 0\} = \{v_1 > 0\}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, m$. In this case $u_j = l_j u_1$, $v_j = \tilde{l}_j v_1$ (with $l_1 = \tilde{l}_1 = 1$) and the functions $\tilde{u} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i l_i^2} u_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^l a_i u_i^2}$, $\tilde{v} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m b_i \tilde{l}_i^2} v_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m b_i v_i^2}$ belong to the class $\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ introduced in [33, Definition 3.2]. Thus by [33, Lemma 6.1] we have that $N(0, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}), 0^+) = N(0, (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}), 0^+) = \alpha$ is equal to 1 and moreover that $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a hyperplane.

Case 2: Either $\bar{u}_1 \equiv \ldots \equiv \bar{u}_k \equiv 0$ or $\bar{v}_1 \equiv \ldots \equiv \bar{v}_k \equiv 0$.

Suppose that $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_l \not\equiv 0$, $l \leqslant k$, and that all the other functions are zero.

If $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})} \cap S^{N-1} = \emptyset$, then all nontrivial components are harmonic, and thus $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, if $\alpha = 1$, then $\bar{u}_i = x \cdot \nu_i$ for some $\nu_i \in S^{N-1}$ and in particular $\Gamma_{\bar{u}_i}$ is a hyperplane and $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a vector space of dimension at most $N - 1$.

Let us now suppose that $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})} \cap S^{N-1} \neq \emptyset$. We will prove this case via an induction argument which follows very closely [33, Section 6]. Because of that, here we will be rather sketchy, providing however all the precise references for the details. We will show that either $\alpha \geqslant 1 + \delta_N$, or $\alpha = 1$ and $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a hyperplane.

Observe that, in dimension 2, each connected component of $S^{N-1} \setminus \{u_i \neq 0\}$ is an arc, and that all these arcs must have the same length. Moreover, $\Gamma_{\bar{u}_i} \cap S^{N-1}$ cannot consist of a single point, as in that case

$$\lambda = \lambda_1(E(\pi)) = \frac{1}{4} < 1, \qquad \text{a contradiction.}$$

Take $\bar{x} \in \Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})} \cap S^{N-1}$, and let A be a connected component of $\{\bar{u}_1 \neq 0\} \cap S^{N-1}$ (we take the first component, without loss of generality) so that $\bar{x}$ is one end of the arc A. Let $\bar{y}$ denote the other end of A, so that $\bar{u}_1(\bar{y}) = 0$. Clearly $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$, and thus there exists another arc B disjoint from A, having $\bar{y}$ as one end point. Let $\bar{z}$ be the other end of B. If $\bar{z} \neq \bar{x}$, we get the existence of at least three disjoint arcs and, as in Subcase 1.1, $\alpha \geqslant 1 + \delta_2$ for some i. If $\bar{z} = \bar{x}$ then we conclude that each arc must be a half circle, and in this case we have $\alpha = 1$ and $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a hyperplane.

Suppose now that we can prove that the same situation occurs for $N - 1$, Case 2. Take $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = r^\alpha(G(\theta), H(\theta))$ in dimension N, belonging to $\mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$. First of all, we can suppose once again that $S^{N-1} \setminus \Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ has at least one, and at most two connected components. As in [33, p. 306], for each $y_0 \in \Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})} \cap S^{N-1}$ we can take a blowup sequence centered at y_0:

$$\tilde{u}_{i,n}(x) = \frac{\bar{u}_i(y_0 + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(y_0, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}), t_n)}}, \qquad \tilde{v}_{i,n}(x) = \frac{\bar{v}_i(y_0 + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(y_0, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}), t_n)}}$$

which converges to

$$\tilde{u}_i = r^{\gamma_{y_0}} \tilde{g}_i(\theta), \qquad \tilde{v}_i = r^{\gamma_{y_0}} \tilde{h}_i(\theta)$$

for some $\gamma_{y_0} > 0$. By the homogeneity of $\bar{u}, \bar{v}$, as in [33, Lemma 6.3], $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$ only depends on $N - 1$ variables, and by the induction hypothesis either $\gamma_{y_0} = 1$ (and $\Gamma_{\tilde{u},\tilde{v}}$ is a hyperplane) or $\gamma_{y_0} \geqslant 1 + \delta_{N-1}$. Now either $\gamma_{y_0} \geqslant 1 + \delta_{N-1}$ for some y_0 – which gives $\alpha \geqslant 1 + \delta_{N-1}$ by the upper semicontinuity of $x \mapsto N(x, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}), 0^+)$ as in [33, Lemma 6.5] – or $\gamma_{y_0} = 1$ for every y_0. In the latter case, we can reason exactly as in [33, p. 307] to conclude that $S^{N-1} \cap \Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a hyperplane, and $\alpha = 1$. □

Remark 3.8. From the previous proof we learn that, given $(\bar{u},\bar{v}) \in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$ with $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, we have that $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a vector space having dimension at most $N-1$. Moreover, it is actually a hyperplane except if possibly either $\bar{u} \equiv 0$ or $\bar{v} \equiv 0$. Via a "Clean-Up" result, in the next subsection we will check that neither $\bar{u}$ nor $\bar{v}$ can vanish when we blowup at a point of $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$. This will yield a more complete characterization of $(\bar{u},\bar{v})$, cf. Theorem 3.16 ahead.

Corollary 3.9. *The set $S_{(u,v)}$ is closed in Ω for every $N \geqslant 2$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.7 combined with the upper semicontinuity of the map $x \mapsto N(x,(u,v),0^+)$. □

Theorem 3.10. *For any $N \geqslant 2$ we have that:*

1. $\mathscr{H}_{dim}(\Gamma_{(u,v)}) \leqslant N-1$*;*
2. $\mathscr{H}_{dim}(S_{(u,v)}) \leqslant N-2$*. If $N=2$ then moreover for any given compact set $\tilde{\Omega} \Subset \Omega$ we have that $S_{(u,v)} \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ is a finite set.*

Proof. Once one knows that both the sets $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{(u,v)}$ are relatively close in each open subset of Ω, and taking in considerations the results on the previous and current subsection, the proof follows almost word by word the one presented in [33, Theorem 4.5] for a similar situation (see also Remark 4.7 therein). The proof there, in turn, is based on the Hausdorff Reduction Principle. □

3.3. **A Clean-Up result. $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is locally flat.** Having established that $S_{(u,v)}$ is negligible, we will now focus on the remaining part of nodal set, namely $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$. We prove in this and in the following subsection that $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is a regular hypersurface. Here we will prove a *Clean-Up* result, which will imply that both $\bar{u},\bar{v} \not\equiv 0$, whenever $(\bar{u},\bar{v}) \in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$ with $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$. This will allow us to prove that, after a blowup at any point, $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is a hyperplane, and it is locally flat.

Given $x \in \Omega$, $\nu \in S^{N-1}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we define the strip

$$S(x,\nu,\varepsilon) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : \ |(y-x)\cdot\nu| \leqslant \varepsilon\}.$$

We saw in the previous subsection (cf. Remark 3.8) that, whenever we take a blowup sequence centered at a point of $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, the limiting nodal set is a vector space, being at most a hyperplane. This implies that $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is locally contained in a small strip.

Lemma 3.11. *Given $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, let $R_0 > 0$ be such that*

$$B_{2R_0}(x_0) \cap \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)} = B_{2R_0}(x_0) \cap \Gamma_{(u,v)}$$

(recall that $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is an open set of $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$). Then

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0,\ \exists 0 < r_0 < R_0 :\ \forall 0 < r < r_0,\ \forall x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0),\ \exists \nu = \nu(x,r) \in S^{N-1} \text{ such that}$$
$$\Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_r(x) \subset S(x,\nu(x,r),\varepsilon r).$$

Proof. Supposing that the conclusion does not hold, then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, $r_n \to 0$, $x_n \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ such that

$$\Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{r_n}(x_n) \not\subseteq S(x_n,\nu,\varepsilon r_n), \qquad \forall \nu \in S^{N-1}.$$

Consider the blowup sequences

$$u_{i,n}(x) = \frac{u_i(x_n + r_n x)}{\rho_n}, \qquad v_{i,n}(x) = \frac{v_i(x_n + r_n x)}{\rho_n}.$$

Then we have

$$\Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)} \cap B_1(0) \not\subseteq S(0,\nu,\varepsilon) \qquad \forall \nu \in S^{N-1}. \tag{3.19}$$

Suppose that $x_n \to \bar{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)} \cap \overline{B_{R_0}(x_0)}$. We have (up to a subsequence)

$$u_{i,n} \to \bar{u}_i, \qquad v_{i,n} \to \bar{v}_i \qquad \text{strongly in } C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{B}_1(0)) \cap H^1(B_1(0))$$

and, as $N(\bar{x},(u,v),0^+)=1$, we know (Remark 3.8) that $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a vector space of dimension at most $N-1$. Thus there exists $\bar{\nu} \in S^{N-1}$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} (\bar{u}_i^2 + \bar{v}_i^2) \geqslant 2\gamma, \qquad \text{in } B_1(0) \setminus S(0,\bar{\nu},\varepsilon) = \{y \in B_1(0) : \ |y \cdot \bar{\nu}| > \varepsilon\}$$

and hence, for large n,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} (\bar{u}_{i,n}^2 + \bar{v}_{i,n}^2) \geqslant \gamma, \qquad \text{in } B_1(0) \setminus S(0,\bar{\nu},\varepsilon),$$

which contradicts (3.19). □

Next we state an independent result, based on a similar one for harmonic functions present in [10, Lemma 12].

Lemma 3.12. *Consider the ball $B_1(0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$. Then for every $a > 0$ there exist $C, \bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that, for every $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}$, and every $w \in C(B_1(0))$ nonnegative, satisfying $-\Delta w \leqslant aw$ in $B_1(0)$ and $w \equiv 0$ in $B_1(0) \setminus S(0,\nu,\varepsilon)$ for some $\nu \in S^{N-1}$, we have*

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}(0)} w \leqslant e^{-C/\varepsilon} \sup_{B_1(0)} w.$$

Proof. Take $\kappa > 0$ large so that

$$|B_\kappa(0) \cap S(0,\nu,1)| \leqslant \frac{1}{4}|B_\kappa(0)|$$

and take $\bar{\varepsilon} = \min\{\frac{1}{2\kappa}, \sqrt{\frac{N+2}{2\kappa^2 a}}\}$. Given $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}$, and $x \in B_{1/2}(0)$, we have $B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x) \subset B_1(0)$, and

$$\frac{|B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x) \cap S(0,\nu,\varepsilon))|}{|B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)|} \leqslant \frac{1}{4}.$$

Then, given $x \in B_{1/2}(0)$, as $-\Delta w \leqslant aw$ in $B_1(0)$,[4]

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &\leqslant \frac{1}{|B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)|} \int_{B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)} w\,dx + \frac{a(\kappa\varepsilon)^2}{2(N+2)} \sup_{B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)} w \\ &\leqslant \frac{|B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x) \cap S(0,\nu,\varepsilon)|}{|B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)|} \sup_{B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)} w + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)} w \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2} \sup_{B_{\kappa\varepsilon}(x)} w, \end{aligned}$$

[4]The first inequality is an easy adaptation of the standard proof of the mean value theorem for subharmonic functions, see for instance [19, Theorem 2.1].

We can now iterate this procedure $\mathrm{int}\left(\frac{1-|x|}{\kappa\varepsilon}\right)$ times (where $\mathrm{int}(\,\cdot\,)$ denotes the integer part of a number), and hence

$$w(x) \leqslant \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\frac{1-|x|}{\kappa\varepsilon}} \sup_{B_1(0)} w \leqslant \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\kappa\varepsilon}} \sup_{B_1(0)} w \qquad \forall x \in B_{1/2}(0),$$

Thus the conclusion holds for $C := \frac{\log 2}{2k} > 0$. □

Given $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}$, let R_0, r_0 be as in Lemma 3.11. For $x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ and $0 < r < r_0$, we define the set

$$\Upsilon_{(x,r)} = \{\nu \in S^{N-1} : \ \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_r(x) \subseteq S(x, \nu, \varepsilon r)\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Lemma 3.13. *If there exists $\bar{r} \leqslant r_0$, $\bar{x} \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$, and $\bar{\nu} \in \Upsilon_{(\bar{x},\bar{r})}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } B_{\bar{r}}(\bar{x}) \setminus S(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu}, \varepsilon\bar{r}),$$

then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } B_r(x) \setminus S(x, \nu, \varepsilon r) \ \forall x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0), \ r \leqslant r_0, \ \nu \in \Upsilon_{(x,r)}.$$

Proof. Take $x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}$, $r < r_0$. Observe that if $\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 = 0$ in $B_r(x) \setminus S(x, \nu, \varepsilon r)$ for some $\nu \in \Upsilon_{(x,r)}$, then $\sum_{i=1}^k v_i^2 > 0$ in such set. Moreover, if $\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 = 0$ in $B_r(x) \setminus S(x, \nu, \varepsilon r)$ for some $\nu \in \Upsilon_{(x,r)}$, then the same is true for all vectors in the latter set.

Thus the map $\varphi : B_{R_0}(x_0) \times (0, r_0) \to \{0, 1\}$ defined as $\varphi(x, r) = 0$ if $\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 = 0$ on $B_r(x) \setminus S(x, \nu, \varepsilon r)$ for some $\nu \in \Upsilon_{(x,r)}$, $\varphi(x, r) = 1$ otherwise, is continuous, hence constant. □

Combining this result with Lemma 3.12, we have the following.

Lemma 3.14. *Suppose there exists $\bar{r} \leqslant r_0$, $\bar{x} \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$, and $\bar{\nu} \in \Upsilon_{(\bar{x},\bar{r})}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 = 0 \quad \text{in } B_{\bar{r}}(\bar{x}) \setminus S(\bar{x}, \bar{\nu}, \varepsilon\bar{r}),$$

Then

$$\sup_{B_{r/2}(x)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 \leqslant e^{-C/\varepsilon} \sup_{B_r(x)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2, \qquad \forall x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0), \ r \leqslant r_0.$$

Proof. Take $x \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$, $r \leqslant r_0$ and $\nu \in \Upsilon_{(x,r)}$. From the previous lemma we know that $\tilde{u} := \sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 = 0$ in $B_r(x) \setminus S(x, \nu, \varepsilon r)$. Moreover, $-\Delta\tilde{u} \leqslant 2(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i^2)\tilde{u}$ in $B_r(x)$, with $\lambda_i = \mu_i/a_i$. Hence, rescaling $\tilde{u}$: $\tilde{u}_1(y) = \tilde{u}(x + ry)$, we have

$$-\Delta\tilde{u}_1 \leqslant a\tilde{u}_1 \text{ in } B_1(0) \text{ for } a = 2R_0^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i^2, \quad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{u}_1 = 0 \text{ in } B_1(0) \setminus S(0, \nu, \varepsilon).$$

Then, by Lemma 3.12,

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}(0)} \tilde{u}_1 \leqslant e^{-C/\varepsilon} \sup_{B_1(0)} \tilde{u}_1,$$

and the lemma follows going back to $\tilde{u}$. □

Proposition 3.15 (Clean-Up)**.** *Take $\bar{x} \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ and suppose that, for small r,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 \equiv 0 \qquad \text{in } B_r(\bar{x}) \setminus S(\bar{x}, \nu(\bar{x}, r), \varepsilon r)$$

for some $\nu(\bar{x}, r) \in \Upsilon_{(\bar{x},r)}$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 \equiv 0 \qquad \text{in } B_{R_0}(x_0).$$

The same results holds for $\sum_{i=1}^{k} v_i^2$ in the place of $\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2$.

Proof. We want to check that the measures $\Delta u_i + \lambda_i u_i$ over $B_{R_0}(x_0)$ is zero for each $i = 1, \dots, k$, doing this by covering this set with balls of radius $1/2^{n+1}$ (here, $\lambda_i = \mu_i / a_i$). Take $\bar{n}$ such that $1/2^{\bar{n}} \leqslant r_0$. Then

$$\sup_{B_{1/2^{n+1}}(\bar{x})} \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 \leqslant e^{-C/\varepsilon} \sup_{B_{1/2^n}(\bar{x})} \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2, \qquad \forall \bar{x} \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0),\ n \geqslant \bar{n}.$$

We can then iterate, obtaining

$$\sup_{B_{1/2^n}(\bar{x})} \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 \leqslant C_1 e^{-\frac{C}{\varepsilon}(n-\bar{n})}, \qquad \forall n \geqslant \bar{n} + 1,$$

for C_1 depending on $\|u\|_\infty$. Observe that if $B_{1/2^{n+1}}(x) \cap \Gamma_{(u,v)} = \emptyset$, then $\Delta u_1 + \lambda_1 u_1 = 0$ on such a ball. Thus (in the sense of measures)

$$\int_{B_{R_0}(x_0)} (\Delta u_i + \lambda_i u_i)\, dx = \int_A (\Delta u_i + \lambda_i u_i)\, dx = \int_A (\Delta u_i^+ + \lambda_i u_i^+)\, dx \ - \int_A (\Delta u_i^- + \lambda_i u_i^-)\, dx$$

for

$$A := \bigcup_{\bar{x} \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)} B_{1/2^{n+1}}(\bar{x}).$$

On the other hand, using a cut-off function argument, it is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leqslant \int_{B_{1/2^{n+1}}(\bar{x})} (\Delta u_i^\pm + \lambda_i u_i^\pm)\, dx &\leqslant C_2 2^{2n} \int_{B_{1/2^n}(\bar{x})} u_i^\pm\, dx \leqslant C_2 2^{2n} \int_{B_{1/2^n}(\bar{x})} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2}\, dx \\ &\leqslant C_2 \frac{2^{2n}}{2^{nN}} e^{-\frac{C}{2\varepsilon}(n-\bar{n})} \leqslant C_3 e^{-\frac{C}{2\varepsilon} n}, \qquad \forall n \geqslant \bar{n},\ N \geqslant 2. \end{aligned}$$

Since we can cover $B_{R_0}(x_0)$ with $((\mathrm{int}(R_0) + 1) 2^{n+2} + 2)^N$ balls of radius $1/2^{n+1}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leqslant \int_A (\Delta u_i^+ + \lambda_i u_i^+)\, dx &\leqslant \sum_{\bar{x} \in A} \int_{B_{1/2^{n+1}(\bar{x})}} (\Delta u_i^+ + \lambda_i u_i^+)\, dx \\ &\leqslant \tilde{C}_4 2^{nN} e^{-\frac{C}{2\varepsilon} n} = C_4 e^{n(N \log 2 - \frac{C}{\varepsilon})} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

if we can choose right from the start $\varepsilon < \frac{C}{N \log 2}$. Since the same result clearly holds also for u_i^-, we conclude that $-\Delta u_i = \lambda_i u_i$ in $B_{R_0}(x_0)$, and by the unique continuation property, since u_i vanishes in a set with nonempty interior, then $u_i \equiv 0$. □

This result has many strong and important consequences.

Theorem 3.16. *Take $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ and $(\bar{u},\bar{v}) \in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$. Then $\bar{u},\bar{v} \not\equiv 0$. Moreover, $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a hyperplane, and there exist $\nu \in S^{N-1}$ and $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_k,\beta_1,\dots,\beta_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\bar{u}_i = \alpha_i (x\cdot\nu)^+, \qquad \bar{v}_i = \beta_i (x\cdot\nu)^- \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{3.20}$$

Furthermore,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i\alpha_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k b_i\beta_i^2, \tag{3.21}$$

so that the function $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i\alpha_i\bar{u}_i - \sum_{i=1}^k b_i\beta_i\bar{v}_i$ is harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Proof. 1. Let $(\bar{u},\bar{v}) \in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$ with $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ and suppose, in view of a contradiction, that $\bar{u} \equiv 0$. Take $x_n \in \Gamma_{(u,v)}$ with $x_n \to x_0$ and $t_n \to 0$ such that

$$u_n(x) = \frac{u(x_n + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_n,(u,v),t_n)}} \to \bar{u}, \qquad v_n(x) = \frac{v(x_n + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_n,(u,v),t_n)}} \to \bar{v}.$$

As $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})} = \Gamma_{\bar{v}}$ is a vector space of dimension at most $N-1$ (cf. Remark 3.8), then there exists $\bar{\nu} \in S^{N-1}$ such that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{u} \equiv 0$ and $\bar{v} \not\equiv 0$ in $B_1(0) \setminus S(0,\bar{\nu},\varepsilon)$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ fixed let $\gamma > 0$ be such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{v}_i^2 \geqslant 2\gamma \quad \text{ in } B_1(0) \setminus S(0,\bar{\nu},\varepsilon).$$

Then, for sufficiently large n,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k v_{i,n}^2 \geqslant \gamma \quad \text{ in } B_1(0) \setminus S(0,\bar{\nu},\varepsilon),$$

and so

$$\sum_{i=1}^k v_i^2 > 0,\ \sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 \equiv 0 \quad \text{ in } B_{t_n}(x_n) \setminus S(x_n,\bar{\nu},t_n\varepsilon).$$

As $t_n < r_0$, $x_n \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ for large n, and $\bar{\nu} \in \Upsilon_{(x_n,t_n)}$, then by Proposition 3.15 we obtain $u \equiv 0$ in $B_r(x_0)$ for small $r > 0$. However, this contradicts the fact that $x_0 \in \Gamma_{(u,v)} = \partial\omega_u \cap \Omega = \omega_v \cap \Omega$ (Corollary 2.24).

2. Next, taking into account the proof of Proposition 3.7 (see also Remark 3.8), we have that $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ is a hyperplane, S^{N-1} splits into two half spheres S^+, S^-, and

$$\bar{u}_i = r g_i(\theta), \qquad \bar{v}_i = r h_i(\theta),$$

where g_i, h_i are all first eigenfunctions respectively on S^+ and S^-. Thus there exists ν so that (3.20) holds.

3. As

$$\Delta\bar{u}_i = 0 \ \text{ in } \overline{\Gamma}^+ := \{x\cdot\nu > 0\}, \qquad \Delta\bar{v}_i = 0 \ \text{ in } \overline{\Gamma}^- := \{x\cdot\nu < 0\},$$

and $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})} = \{x\cdot\nu = 0\}$, given a ball $B_r(x_0)$ we have, by using the Rellich-type formula

$$\operatorname{div}((x-x_0)|\nabla\bar{u}_i|^2 - 2\langle x-x_0,\nabla\bar{u}_i\rangle\nabla\bar{u}_i = (N-2)|\nabla\bar{u}_i|^2 - 2\langle x-x_0,\nabla\bar{u}_i\rangle\Delta\bar{u}_i$$

in $B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}^+$,

$$r\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}^+}(|\nabla\bar u_i|^2-2(\partial_n\bar u_i)^2)d\sigma=(N-2)\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}^+}|\nabla\bar u_i|^2\,dx - \int_{B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}_{(\bar u,\bar v)}}|\nabla\bar u_i|^2\langle\nu,x-x_0\rangle\,d\sigma$$

Analogously,

$$r\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}^-}(|\nabla\bar v_i|^2-2(\partial_n\bar v_i)^2)d\sigma=(N-2)\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}^-}|\nabla\bar v_i|^2\,dx + \int_{B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}_{(\bar u,\bar v)}}|\nabla\bar v_i|^2\langle\nu,x-x_0\rangle\,d\sigma.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap\overline{\Gamma}_{(\bar u,\bar v)}}\left(a_i|\nabla\bar u_i|^2-b_i|\nabla\bar v_i|^2\right)\langle\nu,x-x_0\rangle\,d\sigma=0\qquad\forall x_0\in\mathbb{R}^N,\ r>0,$$

and hence $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i\alpha_i^2=\sum_{i=1}^k b_i\beta_i^2$. □

We are now ready to improve the result of Lemma 3.11, showing that $\Gamma_{(u,v)}\cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ verifies the so called $(N-1)$–dimensional (δ,R_0)– Reifenberg flatness condition for every small ε and some $r_0=r_0(\varepsilon)>0$.

Corollary 3.17. *Within the previous framework, for any given $\delta>0$ there exists $R_0>0$ such that for every $x\in\Gamma_{(u,v)}\cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ and $0<r<R_0$ there exists a hyperplane $H=H_{x,r}$ containing x such that* [5]

$$d_{\mathscr{H}}(\Gamma_U\cap B_r(x),H\cap B_r(x))\leqslant\delta r.$$

Proof. In the ground of Theorem 3.16, the proof follows exactly as the one of [33, Lemma 5.3]. □

The Reifenberg flat condition yields a local separation result.

Corollary 3.18. *Given $x_0\in\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, there exists R_0 such that $\Gamma_{(u,v)}\cap B_{R_0}(x_0)=\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}\cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$, and*

$$B_{R_0}(x_0)\setminus\Gamma_{(u,v)}\qquad\text{has exactly two connected components }\Omega_1,\Omega_2.$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2>0,\ \sum_{i=1}^k v_i^2\equiv0\ \text{ on }\Omega_1\qquad\text{and}\qquad\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2=0,\ \sum_{i=1}^k v_i^2>0\ \text{ on }\Omega_2.$$

Finally, given $y\in\Gamma_{(u,v)}\cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$ and $0<r<R_0$ there exists a hyperplane $H=H_{y,r}$ containing y and a unitary vector $\nu=\nu_{y,r}$ orthogonal to H such that

$$\{x+t\nu\in B_r(y):\ x\in H,\ t\geqslant\delta r\}\subset\Omega_1,\qquad\{x-t\nu\in B_r(y):\ x\in H,\ t\geqslant\delta r\}\subset\Omega_2. \tag{3.22}$$

[5] Here $d_{\mathscr{H}}(A,B):=\max\{\sup_{a\in A}\operatorname{dist}(a,B),\sup_{b\in B}\operatorname{dist}(A,b)\}$ denotes the Hausdorff distance. Notice that $d_{\mathscr{H}}(A,B)\leqslant\delta$ if and only if $A\subseteq N_\delta(B)$ and $B\subseteq N_\delta(A)$, where $N_\delta(\cdot)$ is the closed δ–neighborhood of a set. Observe moreover that when H is a hyperplane, $N_\delta(H)$ is a strip $S(x,\nu,\delta)$ for $x\in H$ and $\nu\in S^{N-1}$ a vector orthogonal to H.

Proof. See [33, Proposition 5.4], or [32, Proposition 3.38] for a detailed proof. For a result in the same direction, check [24, Theorem 4.1] □

Combining (3.22) with Corollary 3.17, we see that both Ω_1 and Ω_2 as defined above are (δ, R_0)– Reifenberg flat domain. We suppose that $\delta > 0$ is small enough so that Ω_1 and Ω_2 are also NTA domains (check Definitions A.1 and A.4 ahead, and [27, Theorem 3.1] for the proof of this result).

3.4. **The set $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is locally a regular hypersurface.** Define

$$U(x) := (\sqrt{a_1}u_1(x), \dots, \sqrt{a_k}u_k(x)), \qquad V(x) := (\sqrt{b_1}v_1(x), \dots, \sqrt{b_k}v_k(x)),$$

and observe that locally $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is characterized as being the set of zeros of $|U(x)| - |V(x)|$. We will prove the regularity of such set by proving by definition that $|U| - |V|$ is differentiable at each point of $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, having nonzero gradient (Theorem 3.27).

We fix $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ and work in $B_{R_0}(x_0)$ as in the previous subsection. We also recall that

$$\Omega_1 = \{x \in B_{R_0}(x_0) : \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_i^2 > 0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_2 = \{x \in B_{R_0}(x_0) : \sum_{i=1}^{k} v_i^2 > 0\}.$$

To simplify the notation, in this subsection we denote $\Gamma := \Gamma_{(u,v)} \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$. Given $x \in \Omega_1$, define

$$\mathcal{U}(x) = \frac{U(x)}{|U(x)|} = \frac{(\sqrt{a_1}u_1(x), \dots, \sqrt{a_k}u_k(x))}{\sqrt{a_1u_1^2(x) + \ldots + a_ku_k^2(x)}}$$

and, for $x \in \Omega_2$,

$$\mathcal{V}(x) = \frac{V(x)}{|V(x)|} = \frac{(\sqrt{b_1}v_1(x), \dots, \sqrt{b_k}v_k(x))}{\sqrt{b_1v_1^2(x) + \ldots + b_kv_k^2(x)}}.$$

Our main interest will be to evaluate $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ at Γ. By Corollary 2.24 (or Proposition A.5 combined with Theorem 3.16) we have that at least one component of u and of v is signed. Suppose from now on, without loss of generality, that $u_1 > 0$ in Ω_1 and $v_1 > 0$ in Ω_2. This crucial fact allows us to apply the regularity results shown in Appendix A. More precisely, $(u, v, \mathrm{int}(\overline{\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2})) \in \mathcal{G}$ (cf. Definition A.6) and so Proposition A.7 implies that $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ can be uniquely extended up to Γ, as soon as one observes that for instance $\mathcal{U}$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{U} = \frac{(\sqrt{a_1}, \sqrt{a_2}\frac{u_2}{u_1} \dots, \sqrt{a_k}\frac{u_k}{u_1})}{\sqrt{a_1 + a_2\left(\frac{u_2}{u_1}\right)^2 \dots + a_k\left(\frac{u_k}{u_1}\right)^2}}$$

Moreover, from this proposition we also deduce that

$$|\mathcal{U}(x) - \mathcal{U}(x_0)| \leqslant Cr^\alpha, \quad |\mathcal{V}(x) - \mathcal{V}(x_0)| \leqslant Cr^\alpha, \qquad \forall x \in B_r(x_0). \tag{3.23}$$

Observe that, formally,

$$\mathcal{U}(x_0) = \lim_{x \to x_0} \frac{U(x)/\mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}{|U(x)/\mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)|} = \frac{-\partial_n U(x_0)}{|\partial_n U(x_0)|}, \quad \mathcal{V}(x_0) = \frac{-\partial_n V(x_0)}{|\partial_n V(x_0)|} \qquad \text{for } x_0 \in \Gamma.$$

Rigorously, however, we can only for the moment observe that $U(y)$, for $y \in \Gamma$, is related to the blowup limits centered at y.

Lemma 3.19. *Take $y \in \Gamma$ and let*

$$(\bar u, \bar v) = (\alpha_1 (x\cdot\nu)^+, \dots, \alpha_k (x\cdot\nu)^+, \beta_1 (x\cdot\nu)^-, \dots, \beta_k (x\cdot\nu)^-) \in \mathcal{BU}_y.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{U}(y) = \frac{(\sqrt{a_1}\bar u_1, \dots, \sqrt{a_k}\bar u_k)}{\sqrt{a_1\bar u_1^2 + \dots + a_k \bar u_k^2}} = \frac{(\sqrt{a_1}\alpha_1, \dots, \sqrt{a_k}\alpha_k)}{\sqrt{a_1\alpha_1^2 + \dots + a_k \alpha_k^2}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}(y) = \frac{(\sqrt{b_1}\bar v_1, \dots, \sqrt{b_k}\bar v_k)}{\sqrt{b_1\bar v_1^2 + \dots + b_k \bar v_k^2}} = \frac{(\sqrt{b_1}\beta_1, \dots, \sqrt{b_k}\beta_k)}{\sqrt{b_1\beta_1^2 + \dots + b_k \beta_k^2}}.$$

Proof. Let $(\bar u, \bar v) \in \mathcal{BU}_y$ be as in the statement, limit of a blowup sequence centered at $x_n \to y$ and with parameter $t_n \downarrow 0$. Take $\bar z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $|(\bar u_1(\bar z), \dots, \bar u_k(\bar z))| \neq 0$ and (for large n) $x_n + t_n \bar z \in \Omega_1$. Then

$$\mathcal{U}(y) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{U(x_n + t_n\bar z)}{|U(x_n + t_n \bar z)|} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{U(x_n + t_n\bar z)/\rho_n}{|U(x_n + t_n \bar z)/\rho_n|} = \frac{(\sqrt{a_1}\bar u_1, \dots, \sqrt{a_k}\bar u_k)}{\sqrt{a_1\bar u_1^2 + \dots a_k \bar u_k^2}},$$

and a similar property holds for $\mathcal{V}$. □

We now define two important auxiliary functions.

Definition 3.20. Given $x_0 \in \Gamma$ we define

$$u_{x_0}(x) = \mathcal{U}(x_0)\cdot U(x), \qquad v_{x_0}(x) = \mathcal{V}(x_0)\cdot V(x).$$

The ideia for considering these functions is the following: given a blowup limit $(\bar u, \bar v)$, the Almgren's monotonicity formula tells us that a certain linear combination of $\bar u_i$ extends in an harmonic way with a linear combination of $\bar v_i$ (Theorem 3.16). However, the coefficients of each linear combination, in general, may vary from point to point (namely the α_i and β_i). Fixing $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ at x_0 together with estimate (3.23) will allow us to control in some sense this variation.

Let us see that u_{x_0}, v_{x_0} are positive close to x_0, and check which problem they solve.

Lemma 3.21. *There exists r_0 such that $u_{x_0} > 0$, $v_{x_0} > 0$ in $B_{r_0}(x_0)$. In particular, there exist* positive *Radon measures $\mathcal{M}_{x_0}$, $\mathcal{N}_{x_0}$, both concentrated on Γ, such that*

$$-\Delta u_{x_0} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i - \mathcal{M}_{x_0}, \quad -\Delta v_{x_0} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i - \mathcal{N}_{x_0} \qquad \text{in } B_{r_0}(x_0).$$

Proof. By using (3.23) we see that

$$u_{x_0}(x) = \mathcal{U}(x)\cdot U(x) + (\mathcal{U}(x_0) - \mathcal{U}(x))\cdot U(x) \geqslant (1 - Cr_0^\alpha)|U(x)| > 0 \quad \forall x \in B_{r_0}(x_0),$$

whenever $r_0 > 0$ is small enough. The rest of the proof follows easily. □

Our aim now it to analyze the difference $\varphi_{x_0} := u_{x_0} - v_{x_0}$, as a first step before analysing $|U| - |V|$ at x_0. For that, let us take a blowup sequence centered at $y \in \Gamma \cap B_{r_0}(x_0)$. Define, given $t_n \to 0^+$,

$$u_{x_0}^{y,t_n}(x) := \frac{u_{x_0}(y + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(y,(u,v),t_n)}}, \qquad v_{x_0}^{y,t_n}(x) := \frac{v_{x_0}(y + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(y,(u,v),t_n)}}.$$

Up to a subsequence, there exists $(\bar u,\bar v)\in\mathcal{BU}_y$ such that

$$u^{y,t_n}_{x_0}\to\mathcal{U}(x_0)\cdot(\sqrt{a_1}\bar u_1,\dots,\sqrt{a_k}\bar u_k)=\mathcal{U}(x_0)\cdot\bar U=:\bar u^y_{x_0}$$
$$v^{y,t_n}_{x_0}\to\mathcal{V}(x_0)\cdot(\sqrt{b_1}\bar v_1,\dots,\sqrt{b_k}\bar v_k)=\mathcal{V}(x_0)\cdot\bar V=:\bar v^y_{x_0}.$$

Observe that, if $y=x_0$, then by Lemma 3.19 one has

$$\bar u^y_y=\sqrt{a_1\bar u_1^2+\ldots+a_k\bar u_k^2},\quad \bar v^y_y=\sqrt{b_1\bar v_1^2+\ldots+b_k\bar v_k^2}\quad\text{for some }(\bar u,\bar v)\in\mathcal{BU}_y.$$

In such a case, by Theorem 3.16 we have

$$\bar u_i=\alpha_i(x\cdot\nu)^+,\qquad \bar v_i=\beta_i(x\cdot\nu)^-$$

with $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i\alpha_i^2=\sum_{i=1}^k b_i\beta_i^2$, so that $\bar u^y_y-\bar v^y_y$ is harmonic. In particular,

$$|\nabla u^y_y(0)|=|\nabla\bar U(0)|=\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i\alpha_i^2}=\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k b_i\beta_i^2}=|\nabla\bar V(0)|=|\nabla\bar v^y_y(0)|\tag{3.24}$$

Lemma 3.22. *Under the previous notations, let*

$$\mathcal{M}^{y,t_n}_{x_0}(\cdot):=\frac{1}{\rho_n t_n^{N-2}}\mathcal{M}_{x_0}(y+t_n\cdot),\quad \mathcal{N}^{y,t_n}_{x_0}(\cdot):=\frac{1}{\rho_n t_n^{N-2}}\mathcal{N}_{x_0}(y+t_n\cdot)$$

with $\rho_n^2=H(y,(u,v),t_n)$, so that in $B_{r_0/t_n}(x_0-y)$

$$-\Delta u^{y,t_n}_{x_0}=t_n^2\sum_{i=1}^k\frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_{i,n}-\mathcal{M}^{y,t_n}_{x_0},\quad -\Delta v^{y,n}_{x_0}=t_n^2\sum_{i=1}^k\frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_{i,n}-\mathcal{N}^{y,n}_{x_0}$$

Then there exists $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^y_{x_0},\overline{\mathcal{N}}^y_{x_0}$ such that

$$\mathcal{M}^{y,t_n}_{x_0}\rightharpoonup\overline{\mathcal{M}}^y_{x_0},\quad \mathcal{N}^{y,t_n}_{x_0}\rightharpoonup\overline{\mathcal{N}}^y_{x_0}$$

and moreover

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^y_{x_0}(E)=\int_{E\cap\overline{\Gamma}}|\nabla\bar u^y_{x_0}|\,d\sigma=|\nabla\bar u^y_{x_0}(0)||E\cap\overline{\Gamma}|,\ \ \overline{\mathcal{N}}^y_{x_0}(E)=\int_{E\cap\overline{\Gamma}}|\nabla\bar v^y_{x_0}|\,d\sigma=|\nabla\bar v^y_{x_0}(0)||E\cap\overline{\Gamma}|.$$

In particular, when $y=x_0$, one has that the limiting measures coincide, that is

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^y_y\equiv\overline{\mathcal{N}}^y_y.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 3.1 and of (3.21) in Theorem 3.16, and so we omit it here. □

This result, together with (3.23) and (3.24), allows us to compare $\mathcal{M}_{x_0}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{x_0}$ close to x_0.

Lemma 3.23. *We have*

$$\mathcal{M}_{x_0}\leqslant(1+Cr^\alpha)\mathcal{N}_{x_0}\quad\text{ and }\quad\mathcal{N}_{x_0}\leqslant(1+Cr^\alpha)\mathcal{M}_{x_0}\qquad\text{in }B_r(x_0)$$

for some $C>0$ independent of x_0 and $r>0$. In particular, the new functions

$$\overline{\varphi}_{x_0,r}:=(1+Cr^\alpha)u_{x_0}-v_{x_0},\quad\text{ and }\quad\underline{\varphi}_{x_0,r}:=u_{x_0}-(1+Cr^\alpha)v_{x_0}$$

satisfy

$$-\Delta\overline{\varphi}_{x_0,r}\leqslant(1+Cr^\alpha)\sum_{i=1}^k\frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i-\sum_{i=1}^k\frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i$$

and

$$-\Delta \underline{\varphi}_{x_0,r} \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i - (1+Cr^\alpha)\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i$$

in $B_r(x_0)$.

Proof. 1. We claim that

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{\mathcal{M}_{x_0}(\overline{B}_t(y))}{\mathcal{N}_{x_0}(\overline{B}_t(y))} \geqslant 1 - Cr^\alpha \qquad \text{for every } y\in \Gamma_{(u,v)}\cap B_r(x_0). \tag{3.25}$$

Fix $y\in\Gamma_{(u,v)}\cap B_r(x_0)$ and consider any arbitrary sequence $t_n\downarrow 0$. Using the previous notations, take $u^{y,t_n}_{x_0}(x)$, $v^{y,t_n}_{x_0}$ and the rescaled measures $\mathcal{M}^{y,t_n}_{x_0}$, $\mathcal{N}^{y,t_n}_{x_0}$; defined the blowup limits by $\bar u^y_{x_0}$, $\bar v^y_{x_0}$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^y_{x_0}$, $\overline{\mathcal{N}}^y_{x_0}$. One has (by [18, Sect. 1.6, Th. 1])

$$\lim_k \frac{\mathcal{M}_{x_0}(\overline{B}_{t_n}(y))}{\mathcal{N}_{x_0}(\overline{B}_{t_n}(y))} = \lim_n \frac{\mathcal{M}^{y,n}_{x_0}(\overline{B}_1(0))}{\mathcal{N}^{y,n}_{x_0}(\overline{B}_1(0))} = \frac{\overline{\mathcal{M}}^y_{x_0}(\overline{B}_1(0))}{\overline{\mathcal{N}}^y_{x_0}(\overline{B}_1(0))} = \frac{|\nabla \bar u^y_{x_0}(0)|}{|\nabla \bar v^y_{x_0}(0)|}. \tag{3.26}$$

Now, for some $(\bar u,\bar v)\in \mathcal{BU}_y$, and $\bar U := (\sqrt{a_1}\bar u_1,\dots,\sqrt{a_k}\bar u_k)$, $\bar V := (\sqrt{b_1}\bar v_1,\dots,\sqrt{b_k}\bar v_k)$,

$$\big||\mathcal{U}(x_0)\cdot\nabla\bar U(0)| - |\mathcal{U}(y)\cdot\nabla\bar U(0)|\big| \leqslant |(\mathcal{U}(x_0)-\mathcal{U}(y))\cdot\nabla\bar U(0)| \leqslant Cr^\alpha|\nabla\bar U(0)| = Cr^\alpha|\nabla\bar u^y_y(0)|,$$

so

$$\big||\nabla\bar u^y_{x_0}(0)| - |\nabla\bar u^y_y(0)|\big| \leqslant Cr^\alpha|\nabla\bar u^y_y(0)|$$

where we have used (3.23) and (3.24). Analogously, one has

$$\big||\nabla\bar v^y_{x_0}(0)| - |\nabla\bar v^y_y(0)|\big| \leqslant Cr^\alpha|\nabla\bar v^y_y(0)|$$

Combining these two inequalities with $|\nabla\bar u^y_y(0)| = |\nabla\bar v^y_y(0)|$ (cf. (3.24)) and (3.26) yields the validity of our initial claim (3.25).

2. By the previous point, we have $D_{\mathcal{N}_{x_0}}\mathcal{M}_{x_0}(y)\leqslant(1+Cr^\alpha)$ for $\mathcal{N}_{x_0}$–a.e. $y\in B_{r_0}(x_0)$ and hence the Radon-Nikodym Decomposition Theorem (check for instance [18, Sect. 1.6, Th. 3]) yields that for every Borel set $E\subseteq B_{r_0}(x_0)$

$$\mathcal{M}_{x_0}(E) = (\mathcal{M}_{x_0})_s(E) + \int_E D_{\mathcal{N}_{x_0}}\mathcal{M}_{x_0}\,d\mathcal{N}_{x_0} \leqslant (1+Cr^\alpha)\mathcal{N}_{x_0}(E).$$

(where $(\mathcal{M}_{x_0})_s\geqslant 0$ represents the singular part of $\mathcal{M}_{x_0}$ with respect to $\mathcal{N}_{x_0}$), and this proves the first inequality in the proposition. The proof of the other inequality follows in the exact same way. □

Recall that $\varphi_{x_0} := u_{x_0} - v_{x_0}$ and let $\psi_{x_0,r}$, for each small $r>0$, be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\psi_{x_0,r} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i - \sum_{i=1}^k\frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i & \text{in } B_r(x_0)\\ \psi_{x_0,r} = \varphi_{x_0} = u_{x_0}-v_{x_0} & \text{on } \partial B_r(x_0).\end{cases}$$

As we will see ahead, $\nabla\psi_{x_0,r}(x_0)$ will be a good approximation, for r small, to a normal vector of $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ at x_0. Having that in mind, our next aim is to estimate the difference $\varphi_{x_0}-\psi_{x_0,r}$ in terms of r, in each ball $B_r(x_0)$. Introduce the auxiliary functions $\overline{\psi}_{x_0,r}$, $\underline{\psi}_{x_0,r}$ defined in $B_r(x_0)$ by the conditions:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} = (1+Cr^\alpha)\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i - \sum_{i=1}^k\frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i & \text{in } B_r(x_0)\\ \overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} = \overline{\varphi}_{x_0,r} = (1+Cr^\alpha)u_{x_0} - v_{x_0} & \text{on } \partial B_r(x_0).\end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \underline{\psi}_{x_0,r} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i - (1+Cr^\alpha)\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i & \text{in } B_r(x_0) \\ \underline{\psi}_{x_0,r} = \underline{\varphi}_{x_0,r} = u_{x_0} - (1+Cr^\alpha)v_{x_0} & \text{on } \partial B_r(x_0). \end{cases}$$

By the comparison principle and since $u_{x_0}, v_{x_0} > 0$, we have that

$$\underline{\psi}_{x_0,r} \leqslant \underline{\varphi}_{x_0,r} \leqslant \varphi_{x_0} \leqslant \overline{\varphi}_{x_0,r} \leqslant \overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} \qquad \text{in } B_r(x_0),$$

and moreover (since also $\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i, \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i > 0$)

$$\underline{\psi}_{x_0,r} \leqslant \psi_{x_0,r} \leqslant \overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} \qquad \text{in } B_r(x_0).$$

Now, since $\overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} - \underline{\psi}_{x_0,r}$ satisfies the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta(\overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} - \underline{\psi}_{x_0,r}) = Cr^\alpha \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{\mu_i}{a_i}\mathcal{U}_i(x_0)u_i + \frac{\nu_i}{b_i}\mathcal{V}_i(x_0)v_i\right) & \text{in } B_r(x_0) \\ \overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} - \underline{\psi}_{x_0,r} = Cr^\alpha(u_{x_0} + v_{x_0}) & \text{on } \partial B_r(x_0). \end{cases}$$

we have, by using also the maximum principle [19, Theorem 3.7] and the fact that u_i, v_i are Lipschitz continuous and zero at x_0,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_{x_0} - \psi_{x_0,r}\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))} &\leqslant \|\overline{\psi}_{x_0,r} - \underline{\psi}_{x_0,r}\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))} \\ &\leqslant C' r^\alpha \|u_{x_0} + v_{x_0}\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_r(x_0))} + C' r^\alpha \sum_{i=1}^k \|u_i + v_i\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))} \\ &\leqslant C'' r^{1+\alpha} \qquad \forall x \in B_r(x_0). \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Proposition 3.24. *There exists*

$$\nu(x_0) := \lim_{r\to 0} \nabla \psi_{x_0,r}(x_0).$$

Moreover, the map $\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^N$, $x_0 \mapsto \nu(x_0)$ is Hölder continuous of order α.

Proof. 1. Fix $r > 0$ and let us prove that $\{\nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^k}(x_0)\}_k$ is a Cauchy sequence. One has

$$\|\varphi_{x_0} - \psi_{x_0,r}\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))} \leqslant Cr^{1+\alpha}, \quad \|\varphi_{x_0} - \psi_{x_0,r/2}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \leqslant \frac{C}{2^{1+\alpha}} r^{1+\alpha},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_{x_0,r} - \psi_{x_0,r/2}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} &\leqslant \|\psi_{x_0,r} - \varphi_{x_0}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} + \|\psi_{x_0,r/2} - \varphi_{x_0}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2}(x_0))} \\ &\leqslant Cr^{1+\alpha} + \frac{C}{2^{1+\alpha}} r^{1+\alpha} = C\left(1 + \frac{1}{2^{1+\alpha}}\right) r^{1+\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

As $\psi_{x_0,r} - \psi_{x_0,r/2}$ is harmonic in $B_{r/2}(x_0)$, then by using classical estimates we have

$$|\nabla \psi_{x_0,r}(x_0) - \nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2}(x_0)| \leqslant C'(1 + \frac{1}{2^{1+\alpha}}) r^\alpha.$$

Iterating this procedure, we obtain

$$|\nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^{n+m}}(x_0) - \nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^m}(x_0)| \leqslant C'(1 + \frac{1}{2^{1+\alpha}}) \left(\sum_{i=m}^{m+n-1} \frac{1}{2^{\alpha i}}\right) r^\alpha. \tag{3.28}$$

Thus, for each $r > 0$, $\{\nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^k}(x_0)\}_k$ is a Cauchy sequence, and thus $\nu(x_0) := \lim_{k\to\infty} \nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^k}(x_0)$ exists.

2. Now let $r_n \to 0$ be an arbitrary sequence. Suppose, without loss of generality, that $\frac{r}{2^{n+1}} < r_n \leqslant \frac{r}{2^n}$ (if not, one can pass to a subsequence of $\{r/2^n\}_n$. Then

$$\|\varphi_{x_0} - \psi_{x_0,r_n}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2^{n+1}}(x_0))} \leqslant C r_n^{1+\alpha}, \quad \|\varphi_{x_0} - \psi_{r/2^{n+1}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2^{n+1}}(x_0))} \leqslant \frac{C}{2^{(n+1)(1+\alpha)}} r^{1+\alpha}.$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi_{x_0,r_n} - \psi_{x_0,r/2^{n+1}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{r/2^{n+1}}(x_0))} &\leqslant C r_n^{1+\alpha} + \frac{C}{2^{(n+1)(1+\alpha)}} r^{1+\alpha} \\ &\leqslant \frac{C}{2^{n(1+\alpha)}} r^{1+\alpha} + \frac{C}{2^{(n+1)(1+\alpha)}} r^{1+\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

Once again by classical estimates,

$$|\nabla \psi_{x_0,r_n}(x_0) - \nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^{n+1}}(x_0)| \leqslant C \left(\frac{1}{2^{n(1+\alpha)}} + \frac{1}{2^{(n+1)(1+\alpha)}} \right) r^\alpha$$

and thus

$$|\nabla \psi_{x_0,r_n}(x_0) - \nu(x_0)| \leqslant |\nabla \psi_{x_0,r_n}(x_0) - \nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^{n+1}}(x_0)| + |\nabla \psi_{x_0,r/2^{n+1}}(x_0) - \nu(x_0)|$$

and now the conclusion follows by taking the limit as $n \to \infty$.

3. Finally, let us prove that $x_0 \mapsto \nu(x_0)$ is Hölder continuous of order α. Take $x_0, x_1 \in \Gamma$ and take $r := |x_0 - x_1|$. From (3.28) we have show that there exists $C > 0$ (independent of the point and of the radius) such that

$$|\nabla \psi_{x_i,r} - \nu(x_i)| \leqslant C r^\alpha.$$

On the other hand, the Hölder continuity of $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{V}$ one can easily show that $\|\varphi_{x_1} - \varphi_{x_0}\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0) \cap B_r(x_1))} \leqslant C r^{1+\alpha}$. Moreover, $\|\varphi_{x_i} - \psi_{r,x_i}\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))} \leqslant C r^{1+\alpha}$. By combining all this we get

$$|\nabla \psi_{x_0,r}(x_0) - \nabla \psi_{x_1,r}(x_0)| \leqslant C r^\alpha,$$

and the proof is complete. □

Remark 3.25. For future reference, we observe that from the previous proof it is also clear that, given $x_r \in B_{r/2}(x_0)$, we also have

$$\nabla \psi_{x_0,r}(x_r) \to \nu(x_0) \qquad \text{as } r \to 0.$$

The following lemma relates $\nu(x_0)$ some blowup limits, providing at the same time that $\nu(x_0) \neq 0$.

Lemma 3.26. *Given $x_0 \in \Gamma_{(u,v)}$. Then for every $(\bar u, \bar v) \in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$ with fixed center x_0 we have that*

$$\bar u_i = \alpha_i \left(x \cdot \frac{\nu(x_0)}{|\nu(x_0)|} \right)^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \bar v_i = \beta_i \left(x \cdot \frac{u(x_0)}{|\nu(x_0)|} \right)^-,$$

for some $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ (not all zero). In particular, $\nu(x_0) \neq 0$.

Proof. Take $\bar u_i, \bar v_i$ coming from a limit of $t_n \to 0$ with fixed center x_0, and define

$$\varphi_{x_0,n}(x) := \frac{u_{x_0}(x_0 + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_0,(u,v),t_n)}} - \frac{v_{x_0}(x_n + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_0,(u,v),t_n)}} \qquad \text{in } B_1(0),$$

which converges to

$$\mathcal{U}(x_0) \cdot (\sqrt{a_1}\bar u_1, \dots, \sqrt{a_k}\bar u_k) - \mathcal{V}(x_0) \cdot (b_1 \bar v_1, \dots, b_k \bar v_k) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \alpha_i^2} (x \cdot \tilde\nu)^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k b_i \beta_i^2} (x \cdot \tilde\nu)^-$$

for some α_i, β_i $(i = 1, \dots, k)$ and $\tilde{\nu} \in S^{N-1}$. On the other hand, we have that

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{x_0,t_n}(x) := \frac{\psi_{x_0,t_n}(x_0 + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_0,(u,v),t_n)}}, \qquad \text{defined in } B_1(0),$$

coincides at the boundary $\partial B_1(0)$ with $\varphi_{x_0,n}(x)$, and hence it converges strongly $C^{2,\gamma}$ (for every $\gamma \in (0,1)$) to $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \alpha_i^2 (x \cdot \tilde{\nu})^2}$. In particular,

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \alpha_i^2}\tilde{\nu} = \lim_n \nabla \widetilde{\psi}_{x_0,t_n}(0) = \lim_n \frac{t_n}{\sqrt{H(x_0,(u,v),t_n)}} \nabla \psi_{x_0,t_n}(x_n) = A\nu(x_0),$$

with $A \neq 0$ being the limit of $t_n/\sqrt{H(x_0,(u,v),t_n)}$. Hence $\nu(x_0) \parallel \tilde{\nu}$. □

We are now ready to prove the regularity of the set $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$.

Theorem 3.27. *The map*

$$|U(x)| - |V(x)| = \sqrt{a_1 u_1^2 + \ldots + a_k u_k^2} - \sqrt{b_1 v_1^2 + \ldots + b_k v_k^2}$$

is differentiable at each $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$, with

$$\nabla \left(|U| - |V| \right)(x_0) = \nu(x_0). \tag{3.29}$$

In particular, the set $\mathcal{R}_{(u,v)}$ is locally a $C^{1,\alpha}$–hypersurface, for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Proof. We prove this by definition, namely we show that

$$\frac{|U(x)| - |V(x)| - \nu(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)}{|x - x_0|} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } x \to x_0.$$

In the following, take $r := 2|x - x_0|$. We have

$$\frac{|\varphi_{x_0}(x) - \psi_{x_0,r}(x)|}{|x - x_0|} \leqslant C r^\alpha \to 0,$$

and

$$\frac{|\psi_{x_0,r}(x_0)|}{|x - x_0|} = \frac{|\psi_{x_0,r}(x_0) - \varphi_{x_0}(x_0)|}{|x - x_0|} \leqslant C r^\alpha \to 0.$$

by (3.27). Moreover,

$$\frac{\psi_{x_0,r}(x) - \psi_{x_0,r}(x_0) - \nu(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)}{|x - x_0|} = (\nabla \psi_{x_0,r}(x_r) - \nu(x_0)) \cdot \frac{x - x_0}{|x - x_0|} \to 0$$

by Remark 3.25. Finally, (3.23) and the Lipschitz continuity of U and V yield

$$\frac{(\mathcal{U}(x) - \mathcal{U}(x_0)) \cdot U(x)}{|x - x_0|} \to 0 \quad \frac{(\mathcal{V}(x) - \mathcal{V}(x_0)) \cdot V(x)}{|x - x_0|} \to 0,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\left| |U(x)| - |V(x)| - \nu(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) \right|}{|x - x_0|} &= \frac{|\mathcal{U}(x) \cdot U(x) - \mathcal{V}(x) \cdot V(x) - \nu(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)|}{|x - x_0|} \\
&\leqslant \frac{|\varphi_{x_0}(x) - \nu(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)|}{|x - x_0|} + \mathrm{o}(1) \\
&\leqslant \frac{|\varphi_{x_0}(x) - \psi_{x_0,r}(x)|}{|x - x_0|} + \frac{|\psi_{x_0,r}(x_0)|}{|x - x_0|} + \frac{\psi_{x_0,r}(x) - \psi_{x_0,r}(x_0) - \nu(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)}{|x - x_0|} + \mathrm{o}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

converges to 0. The last statement of the theorem is now a simple consequence of the Implicit Function Theorem, since $\nu(x_0) \neq 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.6 completed. Items (i), (ii) and (iii) are a consequence of Theorem 2.8 and Corollaries 2.12, 2.23 and 2.24. In item (iv), the fact that $(\bar\omega_1, \dots, \bar\omega_m)$ solves c_∞ is a consequence of Corollary 2.12, while its regularity is provided by Theorem 3.27 (for $N = 2$, the more precise statement for $\Gamma \setminus \mathcal{R}$ follows also from Theorem 3.10, while the equal angle property, at this point, follows exactly as in and [33, p. 305]). Finally, the extremality condition in (v) comes out from (3.29). □

4. The limit of the approximating solutions as $p \to \infty$. Existence and regularity results for the initial problem

4.1. **Properties of the approximating solutions u_p, v_p. Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5.** We are now ready to prove our first two main results, Theorems 1.3 and 1.5. Until now, we have proved existence and regularity for the approximate problem (1.6) and so, in particular, for (1.5). As explained in the introduction, a solution of our initial model problem (1.1) will be obtained by taking $p \to +\infty$ in (1.5). Let us summarize what we have proved so far regarding the latter problem.

Given $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have shown the existence of $u_p = (u_{1p}, \dots, u_{kp})$, $v_p = (u_{1p}, \dots, u_{kp})$, with components in $H^1_0(\Omega) \cap C^{0,1}(\overline{\Omega})$, such that u_p and v_p are segregated (in the sense that $u_{ip} \cdot v_{jp} \equiv 0$ for every i, j), they are L^2–normalized

$$\int_\Omega u_{ip}^2\, dx = \int_\Omega v_{ip}^2\, dx = 1 \qquad \forall i = 1, \dots, k,$$

and mutually H^1_0–orthogonal,

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_{ip} \cdot \nabla u_{jp}\, dx = \int_\Omega \nabla v_{ip} \cdot \nabla v_{jp}\, dx = 0, \qquad \forall i \neq j.$$

We may assume that the components are ordered in the following way

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{1,p}|^2\, dx \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \int_\Omega |\nabla u_{kp}|^2\, dx, \qquad \int_\Omega |\nabla v_{1,p}|^2\, dx \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \int_\Omega |\nabla v_{kp}|^2\, dx. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, there exist coefficients $a_{1p}, \dots, a_{kp}, b_{1p}, \dots, b_{kp} > 0$ and $\mu_{1p}, \dots, \mu_{kp}, \nu_{1p}, \dots, \nu_{kp} > 0$ such that

$$-a_{ip}\Delta u_{ip} = \mu_{ip} u_{ip} \quad \text{in } \omega_{u_p}, \qquad -b_{ip}\Delta v_{ip} = \nu_{ip} v_{ip} \quad \text{in } \omega_{v_p}$$

with

$$\omega_{u_p} = \{|u_p| > 0\} = \Omega \setminus \overline{\{|v_p| > 0\}}, \quad \omega_{v_p} = \{|v_p| > 0\} = \Omega \setminus \overline{\{|u_p| > 0\}},$$

while the coefficients a_{ip} and b_{ip} are given by the following formulas: [6]

$$a_{ip} = \frac{\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{ip}|^2\, dx\right)^{p-1}}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{jp}|^2\, dx\right)^p\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}}, \qquad b_{ip} = \frac{\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v_{ip}|^2\, dx\right)^{p-1}}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v_{jp}|^2\, dx\right)^p\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}}$$

From (4.1), we have the ordering

$$0 < a_{1p} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant a_{kp}, \qquad 0 < b_{1p} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant b_{kp}.$$

[6] Recall that $a_{ip} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_i}(\|u_{1p}\|^2, \dots, \|u_{kp}\|^2)$ and $b_{ip} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_i}(\|v_{1p}\|^2, \dots, \|v_{kp}\|^2)$, for $\psi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \xi_i^p\right)^{1/p}$.

The partition $(\omega_{u_p}, \omega_{v_p})$ solves (1.5), and

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{ip}|^2\,dx\right)^p\right)^{1/p} &+ \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v_{ip}|^2\,dx\right)^p\right)^{1/p} \\ &= \Big(\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j(\omega_{u_p}))^p\Big)^{1/p} + \Big(\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j(\omega_{v_p}))^p\Big)^{1/p} \\ &= \inf_{(\omega_1,\omega_2)\in\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^2 \Big(\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j(\omega_i))^p\Big)^{1/p} =: c_p.\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Finally, the following Pohozaev–type formula holds: given $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(2-N)\sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (a_{ip}|\nabla u_{ip}|^2 + b_{ip}|\nabla v_{ip}|^2)\,dx \\ = \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} a_{ip} r(2(\partial_n u_{ip})^2 - |\nabla u_{ip}|^2)\,d\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} b_{ip} r(2(\partial_n v_{ip})^2 - |\nabla v_{ip}|^2)\,d\sigma \\ + \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} r(\mu_{ip}u_{ip}^2 + \nu_{ip}v_{ip}^2)\,d\sigma - \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} N(\mu_{ip}u_{ip}^2 + \nu_{ip}v_{ip}^2)\,dx.\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

We have also proved that, up to a set of Hausdorff dimension at most $N-2$ (corresponding to $\Sigma_{(u_p,v_p)}$) the common boundary $\partial\omega_{u_p} \cap \Omega = \partial\omega_{v_p} \cap \Omega$ is locally a hypersurface of class $C^{1,\alpha}$, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Lemma 4.1. *We have $c_p \leqslant k^{1/p} c_\infty$. In particular, $\|u_p\|_{H_0^1}, \|v_p\|_{H_0^1}$ are bounded independently of $p \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. The comparison between the levels follows easily from the estimate

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \xi_j^p\right)^{1/p} \leqslant k^{1/p} \max\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k\} \qquad \text{for } \xi_1, \dots, \xi_k \geqslant 0.$$

The H_0^1–boundedness of u_p and v_p then follows directly from (4.2). □

Thus, we have guaranteed the existence of $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_k)$ and $\tilde{v} = (\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_k)$ such that (up to a subsequence)

$$u_p \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}, \quad v_p \rightharpoonup \tilde{v} \qquad \text{in } H_0^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k),$$

and

$$u_p \to \tilde{u}, \quad v_p \to \tilde{v} \qquad \text{in } L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k).$$

In particular, $\tilde{u}_i \cdot \tilde{v}_j = 0$ a.e. in Ω $\forall i, j$, and

$$\int_\Omega \tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j\,dx = \int_\Omega \tilde{v}_i \tilde{v}_j\,dx = \delta_{ij}. \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover, it is easy to check that

$$\left[\frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{ip}|^2\,dx}{k^{1/p}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{kp}|^2\,dx}\right]^{p-1} \leqslant a_{ip} \leqslant 1, \qquad \left[\frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_{ip}|^2\,dx}{k^{1/p}\int_\Omega |\nabla v_{kp}|^2\,dx}\right]^{p-1} \leqslant b_{ip} \leqslant 1.$$

Therefore, there exists $1 \leqslant l \leqslant k$ such that (up to a subsequence)

$$a_{ip}, b_{ip} \to 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, l-1; \qquad a_{ip} \to \tilde{a}_i \neq 0, \quad b_{ip} \to \tilde{b}_i \neq 0 \qquad \forall i = l, \dots, k \tag{4.5}$$

(observe that it is not necessarily true that the same number of components a_i and b_i vanish, and here we just suppose it without loss of generality to make the notations simpler). As

$$a_{ip} \int_\Omega |\nabla u_{ip}|^2 \, dx = \mu_{ip}, \qquad b_{ip} \int_\Omega |\nabla v_{ip}|^2 \, dx = \nu_{ip},$$

also

$$\mu_{ip}, \nu_{ip} \to 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, l-1; \qquad \mu_{ip} \to \tilde{\mu}_i \neq 0, \quad \nu_{ip} \to \tilde{\nu}_i \neq 0 \qquad \forall i = l, \dots, k.$$

In the rest of this section, our aim is to show that:

(H1) $u_{ip} \to \tilde{u}_i$ and $v_{ip} \to \tilde{v}_i$ in $C^{0,\gamma} \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$ for every $0 < \gamma < 1$, $\forall i = l, \dots, k$;
(H2) $\tilde{u}_i$ and $\tilde{v}_i$ are Lipschitz continuous, for every $i = l, \dots, k$;
(H3) The nodal set $\Gamma^l_{\tilde{u},\tilde{v}} := \{x \in \Omega : \tilde{u}_i(x) = \tilde{v}_i(x) = 0, \quad \forall i = l, \dots, k\}$ has Hausdorff measure at most $N-1$, the pair

$$(\widetilde{\omega}_1, \widetilde{\omega}_2) := \left(\operatorname{int}\left(\overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2 > 0 \right\}} \right), \operatorname{int}\left(\overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{v}_i^2 > 0 \right\}} \right) \right), \tag{4.6}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{P}_2(\Omega)$, and it is a regular partition in the sense of Definition 1.1. Moreover, for each regular regular point $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$\lim_{\substack{x \to x_0 \\ x \in \widetilde{\omega}_1}} \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{a}_i |\nabla \tilde{u}_i(x)|^2 = \lim_{\substack{x \to x_0 \\ x \in \widetilde{\omega}_2}} \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{b}_i |\nabla \tilde{v}_i(x)|^2 \neq 0.$$

Once this is proved, we can proceed as follows and end the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5, proving that the optimal partition problem (1.1) is achieved by the open regular partition $(\widetilde{\omega}_1, \widetilde{\omega}_2)$.

Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5. The statements for p fixed in Theorem 1.5 are a direct consequence of Theorem 1.6, while the convergences of a^i_{np} and $\tilde{u}_{np}$ as $p \to \infty$ follow from (4.5) and (H1).

As $\tilde{u}_i \cdot \tilde{v}_j = 0$ for every i, j, and $\Gamma^l_{(\tilde{u},\tilde{v})}$ has dimension at most $N-1$, then

$$\tilde{u}_i = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2 > 0 \right\}}, \qquad \tilde{v}_i = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{v}_i^2 > 0 \right\}}.$$

The sets $\partial\widetilde{\omega}_1 \cap \Omega$, $\partial\widetilde{\omega}_2 \cap \Omega$ have zero Lebesgue measure[7], so $\tilde{u}_i \in H^1_0(\widetilde{\omega}_1)$ and $\tilde{v}_i \in H^1_0(\widetilde{\omega}_2)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, k$. Moreover, from the strong convengence (H1) for u_{kp} together with the weak convergence in H^1_0 which holds for the remaining components u_{ip}, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \tilde{u}_k \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_i \, dx = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, k-1.$$

As $\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_{k-1}$ are linearly independent (because of (4.4)), we conclude that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{u}_k|^2 \, dx \geqslant \lambda_k(\widetilde{\omega}_1) \qquad \text{and, analogously,} \qquad \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{v}_k|^2 \, dx \geqslant \lambda_k(\widetilde{\omega}_2).$$

[7]Although this is not important at this point, we will check ahead that these sets coincide.

Thus (recalling Lemma 4.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_\infty &= \lim_{p\to\infty}(k^{1/p}c_\infty) = \lim_{p\to\infty} c_p \\
&= \lim_{p\to\infty}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{ip}|^2\,dx\right)^p\right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^k\left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v_{ip}|^2\,dx\right)^p\right)^{1/p} \\
&\geqslant \lim_{p\to\infty}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_{kp}|^2\,dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla v_{kp}|^2\,dx \\
&= \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde u_k|^2\,dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde v_k|^2\,dx \\
&\geqslant \lambda_k(\widetilde\omega_1) + \lambda_k(\widetilde\omega_2) \geqslant c_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that c_∞ is achieved by the open regular partition (4.6). The remaining statements now follow from (H2) and (H3). □

Remark 4.2. Observe that the proof for the more general case (1.2) follows exactly in the same way as the one of (1.1). In fact, in the proof of the latter case we have only used properties (F1) and (F2) - cf. the Introduction - of the function $F(x_1,\dots,x_m)=\sum_{i=1}^m x_i$, and never its specific form. Dealing with the general case, one would have to approximate it with

$$\inf_{(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_m)\in\mathcal{P}_m(\Omega)} F\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k_1}(\lambda_j(\omega_1)^p\right)^{1/p},\dots,\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k_m}(\lambda_j(\omega_1)^p\right)^{1/p}\right),$$

instead of (1.5), which would only lead to heavier notations.

So, to conclude, we will show (H1) in the following subsection, and (H2)–(H3) in Subsection 4.3.

4.2. **Proof of property (H1): Strong convergence of the last components of u_p, v_p.** We will follow the ideas of Subsection 2.2, which here apply in an easier way. First, we deduce L^∞ bounds.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $C>0$, independent of p, such that*

$$\|u_{ip}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|v_{ip}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leqslant C, \qquad \forall i=1,\dots,k.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$-\Delta|u_{ip}| \leqslant \frac{\mu_{ip}}{a_{ip}}|u_{ip}| \qquad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and

$$\left|\frac{\mu_{ip}}{a_{ip}}\right| = \int_\Omega |\nabla u_{ip}|^2\,dx \leqslant c_p \leqslant k^{1/p}c_\infty \leqslant kc_\infty.$$

Thus the result follows from a standard Brezis–Kato type argument. □

This is the first step to prove uniform Hölder bounds for the last $k-l+1$ components.

Lemma 4.4. *For each $0<\gamma<1$ there exists $D>0$ such that*

$$\|u_{ip}\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline\Omega)}, \|v_{ip}\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(\overline\Omega)} \leqslant D, \qquad \forall i=l,\dots,k.$$

Proof. Suppose, by contradiction, that

$$L_p := \max_{i=l,\dots,k} \left\{ \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}\\ x\neq y}} \frac{|u_{ip}(x)-u_{ip}(y)|}{|x-y|^\gamma}, \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}\\ x\neq y}} \frac{|v_{ip}(x)-v_{ip}(y)|}{|x-y|^\gamma} \right\} \to \infty$$

as $p\to\infty$, and suppose without loss of generality that L_p is achieved for u_{kp} at x_p, y_p, and that $x_p \in \omega_{u_p}$. Since we have uniform L^∞ bounds, then $r_p := |x_p - y_p| \to 0$. Take, for $i = l,\dots,k$, the rescaled functions

$$\bar u_{ip}(x) = \frac{1}{L_p r_p^\gamma} u_{ip}(x_p + r_p x), \qquad \bar v_{ip}(x) = \frac{1}{L_p r_p^\gamma} v_{ip}(x_p + r_p x), \qquad x\in\Omega_p = \frac{\Omega - x_p}{r_p},$$

which solve

$$\begin{cases} -a_{ip}\Delta \bar u_{ip} = r_p^2 \mu_{ip}\bar u_{ip} & \text{in } \frac{\omega_{u_p}-x_p}{r_p} \\ -b_{ip}\Delta \bar v_{ip} = r_p^2 \nu_{ip}\bar v_{ip} & \text{in } \frac{\omega_{v_p}-x_p}{r_p}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, due to the normalization,

$$\max_{i=l,\dots,k} \left\{ \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}_p\\ x\neq y}} \frac{|\bar u_{ip}(x)-\bar u_{ip}(y)|}{|x-y|^\gamma}, \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}_p\\ x\neq y}} \frac{|\bar v_{ip}(x)-\bar v_{ip}(y)|}{|x-y|^\gamma} \right\} = \left| \bar u_{kp}(0) - \bar u_{kp}\left(\frac{y_p - x_p}{r_p}\right)\right| = 1 \tag{4.7}$$

Let $z_p \in \Gamma_{(u_p,v_p)}$ be such that $\operatorname{dist}(x_p, \Gamma_{(u_p,v_p)}) = |x_p - z_p|$. We now have to split the proof in two cases:

Case 1. Suppose that $|x_p - z_p|/r_p \to \infty$.

Then, given $R>0$, $B_{R\,r_p}(x_p)\subset\omega_{u_p}$, and $-a_{kp}\Delta\bar u_{kp} = r_p^2\mu_{kp}\bar u_{kp}$ in $B_R(0)$ for large p. By taking the auxiliary function $\tilde u_{kp}(x) := \bar u_{kp}(x) - \bar u_{kp}(0)$, we have that it is bounded in $C^{0,\gamma}(B_R(0))$, and there exists $\tilde v_k$ such that

$$\tilde v_{kp} \to \tilde v_k \qquad \text{in } C^{0,\gamma'}(B_R(0)),\ \forall 0<\gamma'<\gamma.$$

As

$$-a_{kp}\Delta\tilde u_{kp} = r_p^2\mu_{kp}\bar u_{kp} = \frac{\mu_{kp} r_p^{2-\gamma}}{L_p} u_{kp}(x_p + r_p\cdot) \to 0 \qquad \text{in } B_R(0),\ \forall R>0,$$

and $a_{kp}\to\tilde a_k \neq 0$, then $\tilde v_k$ is harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^N$, and

$$\sup_{\substack{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^N\\ x\neq y}} \frac{|\tilde v_k(x)-\tilde v_k(x)|}{|x-y|^\gamma} = 1 < \infty. \tag{4.8}$$

Thus [29, Corollary 2.3] yields that $\tilde v_k$ is constant, which contradicts (4.8).

Case 2. Suppose that $|x_p - z_p|/r_p$ is bounded.

In this case, observe that this information combined with (4.7) and

$$\bar u_{ip}\left(\frac{z_p - x_p}{r_p}\right) = \bar v_{ip}\left(\frac{z_p - x_p}{r_p}\right) = 0$$

yields boundedness of $\bar u_{ip}$ and $\bar v_{ip}$ in $C^{0,\gamma}(B_R(0))$–norm for every $R>0$ sufficiently large, $i=l,\dots,k$. Thus there exists $\bar u_i$, $\bar v_i$ $(i=l,\dots,k)$ such that $\bar u_{ip}\to\bar u_i$, $\bar v_{ip}\to\bar v_i$ in $C^{0,\gamma'}(B_R(0))$ for every $0<\gamma'<\gamma$ and $R>0$. As

$$-\Delta\left(\sum_{i=l}^k|\bar u_{ip}|\right)\leqslant r_p^2\sum_{i=1}^k\frac{\mu_{ik}}{a_{ik}}|\bar u_{ip}|,\quad -\Delta\left(\sum_{i=l}^k|\bar v_{ip}|\right)\leqslant r_p^2\sum_{i=l}^k\frac{\nu_{ip}}{b_{ik}}|\bar v_{ip}|\qquad\text{in }\Omega,$$

then the limiting functions $\sum_{i=l}^k|\bar u_i|$ and $\sum_{i=l}^k|\bar v_i|$ are nonnegative in $\mathbb{R}^N$, have a common zero, are subharmonic in $\mathbb{R}^N$, have finite $C^{0,\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ semi-norm and satisfy $\left(\sum_{i=l}^k|\bar u_i|\right)\cdot\left(\sum_{i=l}^k|\bar v_i|\right)\equiv 0$. Thus by the Liouville–type result [29, Proposition 2.2] we have that one of these functions is zero. By (4.7), we necessarily have $\sum_{i=l}^k|\bar v_i|\equiv 0$. Now we can finish this proof *exactly* as in the final part of Step B of the proof of Theorem 2.11-(i) (or as in [29, p. 293]), as soon as we prove an Almgren monotonicity formula for the remaining components.

From (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&(2-N)\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{B_r(x_0)}(a_{ip}|\nabla\bar u_{ip}|^2+b_{ip}|\nabla\bar v_{ip}|^2)\,dx\\&=\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}a_{ip}r(2(\partial_n\bar u_{ip})^2-|\nabla\bar u_{ip}|^2)\,d\sigma+\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}b_{ip}r(2(\partial_n\bar v_{ip})^2-|\nabla\bar v_{ip}|^2)\,d\sigma\\&\quad+\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}r_p^2r(\mu_{ip}\bar u_{ip}^2+\nu_{ip}\bar v_{ip}^2)\,d\sigma-\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{B_r(x_0)}r_p^2N(\mu_{ip}\bar u_{ip}^2+\nu_{ip}\bar v_{ip}^2)\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

and, passing to the limit as $p\to\infty$,

$$(2-N)\sum_{i=l}^k\int_{B_r(x_0)}\tilde a_i|\nabla\bar u_i|^2\,dx=\sum_{i=l}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}\tilde a_ir(2(\partial_n\bar u_i)^2-|\nabla\bar u_i|^2)\,d\sigma$$

for every $x_0\in\mathbb{R}^N$, $r>0$ (observe that, as $a_{ip},b_{ip}\to 0$ from $i=1,\dots,l-1$, the previous sums start from $i=l$). Then, as in Theorem 2.21, for

$$N(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r):=\frac{E(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r)}{H(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r)},$$

with

$$E(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r)=\frac{1}{r^{N-2}}\sum_{i=l}^k\int_{B_r(x_0)}\tilde a_i|\nabla\bar u_i|^2\,dx$$

and

$$H(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r)=\frac{1}{r^{N-1}}\sum_{i=l}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)}\tilde a_i\bar u_i^2\,d\sigma,$$

we can prove a monotonicity result, namely that $N(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r)$ is a nondecreasing function in r, and

$$\frac{d}{dr}\log H(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r)=\frac{2N(x_0,(\bar u_l,\dots,\bar u_k),r)}{r},\qquad\forall x_0\in\mathbb{R}^N,\ r>0.$$

□

We can now end the subsection with the proof of our first aim.

Proof of property (H1). The previous lemma provides the existence of $\tilde{u}_i$, $\tilde{v}_i$ $(i = l, \dots, k)$ such that

$$u_{ip} \to \tilde{u}_i, \quad v_{ip} \to \tilde{v}_i \qquad \text{in } C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}),\ \forall 0 < \gamma < 1.$$

Moreover, it is now clear that

$$\begin{cases} -\tilde{a}_i \Delta \tilde{u}_i = \tilde{\mu}_i \tilde{u}_i & \text{in } \{\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2 > 0\}, \\ -\tilde{b}_i \Delta \tilde{v}_i = \tilde{\nu}_i \tilde{v}_i & \text{in } \{\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{v}_i^2 > 0\}. \end{cases}$$

The strong H_0^1–convergence now follows in a standard way, combining the previous system with the one for u_{ip}, v_{ip}. □

4.3. **Proof of properties (H2) and (H3): Regularity of the last components of $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$, and of the partition $(\widetilde{\omega}_1, \widetilde{\omega}_2)$.** From property (H1), proved before, we garantee the existence of $\tilde{u}_i, \tilde{v}_i \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for every $i = l, \dots, k$, which satisfy

$$-\tilde{a}_i \Delta \tilde{u}_i = \tilde{\mu}_i \tilde{u}_i \text{ in the open set } \left\{ \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2 > 0 \right\},$$

while

$$-\tilde{b}_i \Delta \tilde{v}_i = \tilde{\nu}_i \tilde{v}_i \text{ in the open set } \left\{ \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{v}_i^2 > 0 \right\}.$$

Moreover, by passing to the limit $p \to \infty$ in (4.3), we get the limiting local Pohozaev–type formula:

$$\begin{aligned} (2-N) \sum_{i=l}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (\tilde{a}_i |\nabla \tilde{u}_i|^2 + \tilde{b}_i |\nabla \tilde{v}_i|^2)\, dx \\ = \sum_{i=l}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \tilde{a}_i r (2(\partial_n \tilde{u}_i)^2 - |\nabla \tilde{u}_i|^2)\, d\sigma + \sum_{i=l}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \tilde{b}_i r (2(\partial_n \tilde{v}_i)^2 - |\nabla \tilde{v}_i|^2)\, d\sigma \\ + \sum_{i=l}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} r(\tilde{\mu}_i \tilde{u}_i^2 + \tilde{\nu}_i \tilde{v}_i^2)\, d\sigma - \sum_{i=l}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} N(\tilde{\mu}_i \tilde{u}_i^2 + \tilde{\nu}_i \tilde{v}_i^2)\, dx, \end{aligned}$$

for every $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega))$.

Having these properties at hand, the regularity of the pair $(\widetilde{\omega}_1, \widetilde{\omega}_2)$ follows almost exactly as in Section 3. In this subsection we will simply go through the proof, highlighting the similarities and the differences with respect to what we already presented. One difference is that one needs to work with the components $(\tilde{u}_l, \dots, \tilde{u}_k, \tilde{v}_l, \dots, \tilde{v}_k)$ instead of with the whole vector $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$. Another delicate point is that although some results apply to the common nodal set

$$\Gamma^l_{\tilde{u},\tilde{v}} = \{x \in \Omega :\ \tilde{u}_i(x) = \tilde{v}_i(x) = 0,\ \ \forall i = l, \dots, k\},$$

the regularity is proved only for its subsets $\partial\widetilde{\omega}_1$, $\partial\widetilde{\omega}_2$. A first simple by crucial observation is the following.

Lemma 4.5. *We have $\partial\widetilde{\omega}_1 \cap \Omega = \partial\widetilde{\omega}_2 \cap \Omega \subseteq \Gamma^l_{(\tilde{u},\tilde{v})}$.*

Proof. Take $x_0 \in \partial\widetilde{\omega}_1 \cap \Omega$, so that in particular $\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2(x_0) = 0$. Suppose, in view of a contradiction, that $x_0 \notin \partial\widetilde{\omega}_2 \cap \Omega$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ so that $\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{v}_i^2 \equiv 0$ in $B_\delta(x_0)$. For every $x \in B_\delta(x_0)$, as $\Gamma^l_{(\tilde{u},\tilde{v})}$ has non empty interior, then in each neighborhood of x

there exists a point where $\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2 > 0$, whence $x \in \overline{\{\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2 > 0\}}$. We have concluded that $B_\delta(x_0) \subseteq \overline{\{\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde{u}_i^2 > 0\}}$, therefore $x_0 \in \widetilde{\omega}_1$, a contradiction. The other inclusion is proved in a similar way. □

Let us describe the proofs of (H2) and (H3). From the system and the local Pohozaev–type identities, we have a version of the Almgren's Monotonicity Formula (Theorem 2.21) for $(\bar{u}_l, \dots, \bar{u}_k), (\bar{v}_l, \dots, \bar{v}_k)$.

Theorem 4.6. *Take*

$$\widetilde{E}(x_0, r) = \frac{1}{r^{N-2}} \sum_{i=l}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (\tilde{a}_i |\nabla \tilde{u}_i|^2 + \tilde{b}_i |\nabla \tilde{v}_i|^2)\, dx,$$

$$\widetilde{H}(x_0, r) = \frac{1}{r^{N-1}} \sum_{i=l}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (\tilde{a}_i \tilde{u}_i^2 + \tilde{b}_i \tilde{v}_i^2)\, d\sigma,$$

and

$$\widetilde{N}(x_0, r) = \frac{\widetilde{E}(x_0, r)}{\widetilde{H}(x_0, r)}.$$

Then given $\tilde{\Omega} \Subset \Omega$ there exists $C > 0$ and $\tilde{r} > 0$ such that, for every $x_0 \in \tilde{\Omega}$, $e^{Cr^2}(N(x_0, (u, v), r) + 1)$ is a non decreasing function for $r \in (0, \tilde{r}]$, and the limit $N(x_0, (u, v), 0^+) := \lim_{r \to 0^+} N(x_0, (u, v), r)$ exists and is finite. Also,

$$\frac{d}{dr} \log(H(x_0, (u, v), r)) = \frac{2}{r} N(x_0, (u, v), r) \qquad \forall r \in (0, \tilde{r})$$

and $\Gamma^l_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})}$ has no interior points.

This implies versions of Corollaries 2.22 and 2.23; in particular, $\tilde{u}_i, \tilde{v}_i$ are Lipschitz continuous for $i = l, \dots, k$ (hence (H2) is proved), and $N(x_0, 0^+) \geqslant 1$ whenever $x_0 \in \Gamma^l_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})}$. Similarly to Proposition 2.25, we prove that for $i \geqslant l$ there exist measures $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_i, \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i$ supported on $\Gamma^l_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})}$, such that

$$-\tilde{a}_i \Delta \tilde{u}_i = \tilde{\mu}_i \tilde{u}_i - \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_i, \quad -\tilde{b} \Delta \tilde{v}_i = \tilde{\nu}_i \tilde{v}_i - \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i \qquad \text{in } \mathscr{D}'(\Omega).$$

Let us now pass through the results of Section 3. From the monotonicity formula and the equations for $\tilde{u}_i, \tilde{v}_i$, we can repeat the arguments of Subsection 3.1, obtaining that, given $\tilde{\Omega} \Subset \Omega$ and sequences $x_n \in \widetilde{\Omega}$, $t_n \to 0$, then

$$\tilde{u}_{i,n}(x) := \frac{\bar{u}_i(x_n + t_n x)}{\sqrt{\widetilde{H}(x_n, t_n)}} \to \bar{u}_i, \quad \tilde{v}_{i,n}(x) := \frac{\bar{v}_i(x_n + t_n x)}{\sqrt{\widetilde{H}(x_n, t_n)}} \to \bar{v}_i$$

in $C^{0,\gamma}_{\mathrm{loc}} \cap H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, for every $l \leqslant i \leqslant k$, $0 < \gamma < 1$. Moreover, $(\bar{u}_l, \dots, \bar{u}_k, \bar{v}_l, \dots, \bar{v}_k) \neq 0$, $\bar{u}_i \cdot \bar{v}_j = 0$ $\forall i, j = l, \dots, k$, and

$$-\tilde{a}_i \Delta \bar{u}_i = -\bar{\mathcal{M}}_i, \quad -\tilde{b}_i \Delta \bar{v}_i = -\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i,$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_i, \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i$ are measures concentrated on

$$\Gamma^l_{(\bar{u}, \bar{v})} := \{x \in \Omega : \ \bar{u}_i(x) = \bar{v}_i(x) = 0 \ \forall i = l, \dots, k\}.$$

Finally, we also have a local Pohozaev type identity, which yields an Almgren monotonicity formula similar to Corollary 3.3, this time for the limiting Almgren's quotient

$$\bar N(x_0,r) := \frac{\bar E(x_0,r)}{\bar H(x_0,r)} = \frac{r\sum_{i=l}^k \int_{B_r(x_0)} (\tilde a_i|\nabla \bar u_i|^2 + \tilde b_i|\nabla \bar v_i|^2)\,dx}{\sum_{i=l}^k \int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} (\tilde a_i \bar u_i^2 + \tilde b_i \bar v_i^2)\,d\sigma}.$$

In particular, $\Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}$ has an empty interior, and if x_n is either a constant sequence, or $x_n \in \Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}$ satisfies $x_n \to x_0$ with $\bar N(x_0,0^+)=1$, then

$$\bar N(0,r) \equiv \widetilde N(x_0,r) =: \alpha \qquad \text{for every } r>0$$

and the limiting functions in polar coordinates write as

$$\bar u_i = r^\alpha g_i(\theta), \qquad \bar v_i = r^\alpha h_i(\theta),$$

with

$$-\Delta_{S^{N-1}} g_i = \lambda g_i \quad -\Delta_{S^{N-1}} h_i = \lambda h_i \quad \text{in } S^{N-1}\setminus \Gamma^l_{(\bar u,\bar v)}, \qquad \lambda = \alpha(\alpha+N-2).$$

Following now Subsection 3.2, we define

$$\mathcal{R}^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)} = \{x \in \Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)} :\ \widetilde N(x,0^+)=1\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)} = \{x \in \Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)} :\ \widetilde N(x,0^+)>1\}.$$

Following word by word the proofs presented there, we get the existence of $\delta_N>0$ such that

$$\forall x_0 \in \Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}, \quad \text{either} \quad \widetilde N(x_0,0^+)=1 \ \text{ or } \widetilde N(x_0,0^+) \geqslant 1+\delta_N$$

(as in Proposition 3.7). This implies (Theorem 3.10) that

$$\mathscr{H}_{\dim}(\Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}) \leqslant N-1, \qquad \mathscr{H}_{dim}(\mathcal{S}^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}) \leqslant N-2,$$

which yields the first part of property (G2). Moreover, as observed in Remark 3.8, given a blowup limit $(\bar u,\bar v)\in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$ with $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}$, the nodal set $\Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}$ is a vector space which is at most a hyperplane; if $\bar u,\bar v \not\equiv 0$, then it is actually an hyperplane.

By using a Clean-Up result (Proposition 3.15), we know that if $\bar v \equiv 0$ then also $\tilde v \equiv 0$ in a neighborhood of x_0. However, this can well be the case for some $x_0 \in \Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}$. This is the reason why, when going through Subsections 3.3 and 3.4, we need to restrict our attention to

$$\widetilde\Gamma := \partial\widetilde\omega_1 \cap \Omega = \partial\widetilde\omega_2 \cap \Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{R}} := \widetilde\Gamma \cap \mathcal{R}^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)}.$$

Given $x_0 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ and $(\bar u,\bar v)\in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$, exactly as in Theorem 3.16 one can now prove that $\bar u,\bar v \not\equiv 0$, and show the existence of $\nu \in S^{N-1}$ and $\alpha_i,\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ $(l \leqslant i \leqslant k)$ such that

$$\bar u_i = \alpha_i (x\cdot\nu)^+,\ \bar v_i = \beta_i (x\cdot\nu)^-, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde a_i \alpha_i^2 = \sum_{i=l}^k \tilde b_i \beta_i^2. \tag{4.9}$$

As a corollary, we obtain that given $x_0 \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ there exists $R_0>0$ such that

$$B_{R_0}(x_0)\setminus \Gamma^l_{(\tilde u,\tilde v)} = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2,$$

with $\Omega_1\cap\Omega_2=\emptyset$, and Ω_1,Ω_2 are (δ,R_0)–Reifenberg flat and NTA domains. Moreover,

$$\sum_{i=l}^k \tilde u_i^2 > 0,\ \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde v_i^2 \equiv 0 \text{ on } \Omega_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde u_i^2 = 0,\ \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde v_i^2 > 0 \text{ on } \Omega_2.$$

Define

$$\widetilde{U}(x) = (\sqrt{\tilde{a}_l}\tilde{u}_l(x), \dots, \sqrt{\tilde{a}_k}\tilde{u}_k(x)), \qquad \mathcal{U}(x) := \frac{\widetilde{U}(x)}{|\widetilde{U}(x)|}, \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega_1$$

and

$$\widetilde{V}(x) = (\sqrt{\tilde{b}_l}\tilde{v}_l(x), \dots, \sqrt{\tilde{b}_k}\tilde{v}_k(x)), \qquad \mathcal{V}(x) := \frac{\widetilde{V}(x)}{|\widetilde{V}(x)|}, \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega_2.$$

Proposition A.5 together with (4.9) implies that at least one component among $(\tilde{u}_l, \dots, \tilde{u}_k)$ and among $(\tilde{v}_l, \dots, \tilde{v}_k)$ is signed in a neighborhood of x_0. Thus, since $(\tilde{u}_l, \dots, \tilde{u}_k, \tilde{v}_l, \dots, \tilde{v}_k, \mathrm{int}(\overline{\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2})) \in \mathcal{G}$ (check Definition A.6), as before, we can extend $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ up to $\Gamma := \partial\Omega_1 \cap \partial\Omega_2 \cap B_{r_0}(x_0)$, and (3.23) holds. The rest of Subsection 3.4 can now be applied to our situation.

In conclusion, we have shown that $\widetilde{R}_{(\tilde{u},\tilde{v})}$ is locally a $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurface. As the remaining part of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ has Hausdorff dimension at most $N-2$, we have thus proved property (H2), as wanted. Having proved by now (H1), (H2) and (H3), as seen in the end of Subsection 4.1 we have everything we need in order to prove Theorems 1.3 and 1.5.

Appendix A. Boundary behavior on NTA and Reifenberg flat domains

A.1. **Results on NTA domains.** For convenience of the reader, we recall here the notion of *non-tangencially accessible domain* (NTA), introduced in [25] (the version we present here is taken from [28]).

Definition A.1. A bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is called an NTA if there exist $M, r_0 > 0$ (the NTA constants) such that

(1) *Corkscrew condition:* Given $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $0 < r < r_0$ there exist $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that
$$M^{-1}r < \mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega) < |x - x_0| < Mr.$$
(2) $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ satisfies the corkscrew condition
(3) If $w \in \partial\Omega$ and $w_1, w_2 \in B(w, r_0) \cap \Omega$, then there is a rectifiable curve $\gamma : [0,1] \to \Omega$ with $\gamma(0) = w_1$, $\gamma(1) = w_2$, and:
   (a) $\mathscr{H}^1(\gamma) \leqslant M|w_1 - w_2|$,
   (b) $\min\{\mathscr{H}^1(\gamma([0,t])), \mathscr{H}^1(\gamma([t,1]))\} \leqslant M\mathrm{dist}(\gamma(t), \partial\Omega)$.

Based on the seminal work of Jerison and Kenig [25] (see also the book [26]), we prove a boundary Harnack principle for solutions of

$$-\Delta w = \lambda w \tag{A.1}$$

for some $\lambda > 0$, in a NTA domain.

Lemma A.2. *Let Ω be an NTA domain, $\lambda > 0$, and $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. Then there exist $R_0, C > 0$ (depending only on λ and the NTA constants) such that for every $0 < 2r < R_0$ and for every u, v solutions of* (A.1) *in $\Omega \cap B_{2r}(x_0)$ with $u = v$ on $\partial\Omega \cap B_{2r}(x_0)$, and $u, v > 0$ in Ω, then*

$$C^{-1}\frac{v(y)}{u(y)} \leqslant \frac{v(x)}{u(x)} \leqslant C\frac{v(y)}{u(y)}$$

for every $x \in \overline{\Omega} \cap B_r(x_0)$, $y \in \Omega \cap B_r(x_0)$.

Proof. Let $R_0 > 0$ be so that there exists $\varphi_0 \geqslant 0$ nontrivial solution of

$$-\Delta\varphi = \lambda\varphi_0 \text{ in } B_{3R_0}(x_0), \qquad \varphi_0 = 0 \text{ on } \partial B_{3R_0}(x_0).$$

Then $\varphi_0 > 0$ on $\overline{B_{2R_0}(x_0)}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div}(\varphi_0^2\nabla(\frac{w}{\varphi_0})) &= \operatorname{div}(\nabla w\varphi_0 - w\nabla\varphi_0)\\ &= \Delta w\varphi_0 - \nabla w\nabla\varphi_0 - \nabla w\nabla\varphi_0 - w\Delta\varphi_0 = 0 \quad \text{ in } B_{2R_0}(x_0)\end{aligned}$$

for $w \equiv u$ and $w \equiv v$. Thus we can apply [26, Lemma 1.3.7] to $u/\varphi_0, v/\varphi_0$, which provides the result. □

By using the same strategy, we can use [25, 26] to prove that v/u is α–Hölder continuous.

Lemma A.3. *Let Ω be an NTA domain, $\lambda > 0$, and $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$. There exist $R_0, C > 0$ (depending only on λ and the NTA constants) such that for every $0 < 2r < R_0$ and for every u, v solutions of* (A.1) *in $\Omega \cap B_{2r}(x_0)$ with $u = v$ on $\partial\Omega \cap B_{2r}(x_0)$, and $u, v > 0$ in Ω, then there exists α (depending only on λ and on the NTA constants) such that*

$$\frac{v}{u} \text{ is Hölder continuous of order } \alpha \text{ on } \overline{\Omega \cap B_r(x_0)}.$$

More precisely,

$$\left|\frac{v(x)}{u(x)} - \frac{v(y)}{u(y)}\right| \leqslant C\frac{v(z)}{u(z)}\frac{|x-y|^\alpha}{r^\alpha}, \qquad \forall x, y \in \overline{\Omega \cap B_r(x_0)},\ z \in \Omega \cap B_r(x_0).$$

A.2. **Results on Reifenberg flat domains.** Next, we prove that if some blowup limit of a λ–harmonic function u centered at 0 converges to a nonnegative, nontrivial function, then $u > 0$ in a neighborhood of x_0. First, we need the following result, which holds for Reifenberg flat domains. Let us recall its definition.

Definition A.4. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open set and take $\delta, R > 0$. We say that Ω is a (δ, R)–Reifenberg flat domain if:

- $\forall x \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a hyperplane $H = H_{x,R}$ containing x, and $\nu = \nu(x, R) \in S^{N-1}$ orthogonal to H such that

$$\{x + t\nu \in B_R(x) :\ x \in H,\ t \geqslant 2\delta R\} \subset \Omega,$$
$$\{x - t\nu \in B_R(x) :\ x \in H,\ t \geqslant 2\delta R\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega.$$

- $\forall x \in \partial\Omega$, $0 < r < R$ there exists a hyperplane $H = H_{x,r}$ containing x such that

$$d_{\mathscr{H}}(\partial\Omega \cap B_r(x), H \cap B_r(x)) \leqslant \delta r.$$

Recall that for $\delta = \delta(N) > 0$ sufficiently small a (δ, R)–Reifenberg flat domain is NTA [27, Theorem 3.1]. We assume from now take we have such δ.

Proposition A.5. *Let Ω be a Reifenberg flat domain, and take u such that $-\Delta u = \lambda u$ in Ω, for some $\lambda > 0$. Take $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and suppose that $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$. If, for some sequences $t_n, \rho_n \to 0$, we have*

$$u_n(x) := \frac{u(x_0 + t_n x)}{\rho_n} \to \bar{u} \geqslant 0 \text{ in } C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}),$$

with $\bar{u} \not\equiv 0$, then

$$u > 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_r(x_0)$$

for some sufficiently small $r > 0$.

Proof. Define by w_n, z_n the λ–harmonic extensions of u^+ and u^- on $B_{2t_n}(x_0)\cap\Omega$, namely:

$$-\Delta w_n = \lambda w_n \quad -\Delta z_n = \lambda z_n \quad \text{in } B_{2t_n}(x_0)\cap\Omega,$$
$$w_n = u^+, \quad z_n = u^- \qquad \text{on } \partial(B_{2t_n}(x_0)\cap\Omega).$$

and observe that $u = w_n - z_n$ in $B_{2t_n}(x_0)\cap\Omega$. Let $\widetilde{w}_n$, $\widetilde{z}_n$ denote the blowups

$$\widetilde{w}_n = \frac{w_n(x_0+t_nx)}{\rho_n} \text{ and } \widetilde{z}_n = \frac{z_n(x_0+t_nx)}{\rho_n}, \qquad \text{defined in } B_2(0)\cap\left(\frac{\Omega-x_0}{t_n}\right).$$

At the limit, we find a harmonic equation in an half sphere (since Ω is a Reifenberg flat domain), and the boundary data converges to $\bar{u}$ and 0 respectively; hence we have

$$\widetilde{w}_n \to \bar{u}_i, \qquad \widetilde{z}_n \to 0 \qquad \text{in a half-sphere of radius 2.}$$

Thus there exists $\bar{y}\in\partial B_{1/2}(0)\cap\left(\frac{\Omega-x_0}{t_n}\right)$ such that

$$\frac{z_n(\bar{y})}{w_n(\bar{y})} = \frac{\tilde{z}_n(\bar{y})}{w_n(\bar{y})} < \frac{1}{C}$$

for n large, where C is the constant introduced in Lemma A.2, depending only on λ and on the NTA constants of Ω. Then by this very same lemma applied to z_n, w_n, we have

$$\frac{z_n(x_0+t_nx)}{w_n(x_0+t_nx)} \leqslant C\frac{\tilde{z}_n(\bar{y})}{w_n(\bar{y})} < 1 \qquad \forall x\in B_1(0)\cap\frac{\Omega-x_0}{t_n},$$

and so $u = w_n - z_n > 0$ in $B_{r_n}(x_0)$ for sufficiently large n. □

Throughout this article we need a version of Lemma A.3 for u and v solutions of problems like (A.1) with different λ's. We were not able to prove this fact in general (and we are not sure it is actually true), but we were able to prove it for the situation we need.

Definition A.6. We say that the triple (u, v, Ω), with $(u, v) = (u_1, \dots, u_k; v_1, \dots, v_k)$ defined in Ω, belongs to the class $\mathcal{G}$ if:

- (G1) $\Omega = \Omega_1\dot\cup\Omega_2\dot\cup\Gamma$, where $\Gamma = \partial\Omega_1\cap\partial\Omega_2$ and Ω_1, Ω_2 are Reifenberg flat domains (as well as NTA).
- (G2) $\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2$ is positive in Ω_1, zero in Ω_2; $\sum_{i=1}^k v_i^2$ is zero in Ω_1, positive in Ω_2;
- (G3) u, v are Lipschitz continuous in $\overline{\Omega}$, and $u = v = 0$ on Γ;
- (G4) there exists $a_i, b_i, \lambda_i, \mu_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ so that
$$-a_i\Delta u_i = \lambda_i u_i \text{ in } \Omega_1, \quad -b_i\Delta v_i = \mu_i v_i \text{ in } \Omega_2;$$
- (G5) Given $x_0\in\Omega$ and $r\in(0, \operatorname{dist}(x_0,\partial\Omega))$, we have that

$$(2-N)\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{B_r(x_0)}(a_i|\nabla u_i|^2 + b_i|\nabla v_i|^2)\,dx$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} a_i r(2(\partial_n u_i)^2 - |\nabla u_i|^2)\,d\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} b_i r(2(\partial_n v_i)^2 - |\nabla v_i|^2)\,d\sigma$$
$$+\sum_{i=1}^k\int_{\partial B_r(x_0)} r(\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\,d\sigma - \sum_{i=1}^k\int_{B_r(x_0)} N(\mu_i u_i^2 + \nu_i v_i^2)\,dx.$$

Suppose without loss of generality that $u_1 > 0$ in Ω_1, $v_1 > 0$ in Ω_2, and take $x_0\in\Gamma$ so that $B_r(x_0)\cap\partial\Omega_1 = B_r(x_0)\cap\partial\Omega_2\subseteq\Gamma$. Our aim in the remaining part of this appendix is to prove the following result.

Proposition A.7. *Within the previous framework, there exists $C > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$ (independent of $r > 0$) such that, for each $i \neq 1$,*

$$\left| \frac{u_i(x)}{u_1(x)} - \frac{u_i(x_0)}{u_1(x_0)} \right| \leqslant C r^\alpha \qquad \forall x \in \overline{B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1}.$$

In particular, u_i/u_1 is Hölder continuous of order α in $\overline{B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1}$.

Similar results hold also for v_i/v_1 in $\overline{B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_2}$.

We will present the proof for u (the one for v is analogous). The idea is to consider suitable deformations of u_1 so that the result is either a sub solution or super solution of $-a_1 \Delta u_1 = \lambda_1 u_1$ with comparable boundary data, considering afterwards some λ_1/a_1–harmonic extension in view of using Lemma A.3. We start by deforming u_1 into a sub solution of the original equation. In order to do that, we need to prove first that u_1 survives for *any* blowup, which already requires some work.

Take $\varepsilon > 0$, and take $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$g(s) = s + \frac{s^{3-\varepsilon}}{(3-\varepsilon)(2-\varepsilon)}.$$

Consider any function w satisfying $-\Delta w \leqslant \lambda w$ having $|w|$ small. Then

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(g \circ w) &= -\mathrm{div}(g'(w)\nabla w) = -g'(w)\Delta w - g''(w)|\nabla w|^2 \leqslant \lambda g'(w) w - g''(w)|\nabla w|^2 \\ &= \lambda \left(1 + \frac{w^{2-\varepsilon}}{2-\varepsilon}\right) w - w^{1-\varepsilon}|\nabla w|^2 = w \left(\lambda - |\nabla w|^2 w^{-\varepsilon} + \frac{\lambda}{2-\varepsilon} w^{2-\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= w \left(\lambda - \frac{|\nabla w|^2 d^2(x)}{w^2} \frac{w^{2-\varepsilon}}{d^2(x)} + \frac{\lambda}{2-\varepsilon} w^{2-\varepsilon}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where we denote $d(x) := \mathrm{dist}(x, \Gamma)$. We will apply this deformation to the auxiliary function $\rho(x) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2\right)^{1/2}$, which satisfies (after a direct computation):

$$-\Delta \rho \leqslant \bar{\lambda} \rho \quad \text{ in } \Omega_1, \qquad \text{for } \bar{\lambda} := \max\left\{ \frac{\lambda_i}{a_i}, i = 1, \dots, k \right\}.$$

Lemma A.8. *Given $x_0 \in \Gamma$, there exists R_0 and $C > 0$ such that, for every $x \in B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$,*

(i) $C^{-1} \leqslant \dfrac{|\nabla \rho(x)|^2 d^2(x)}{\rho^2(x)} \leqslant C$;

(ii) $\lim\limits_{x \to x_0} \dfrac{\rho(x)^{2-\varepsilon}}{d^2(x)} = +\infty$, *for some $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. (i) The proof goes by contradiction. Suppose that there exists $r_n \to 0$ and $x_n \in B_{r_n}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$ such that

$$\frac{|\nabla \rho(x_n)|^2 d^2(x_n)}{v^2(x_n)} \qquad \text{converges either to 0 or to } +\infty.$$

Take $t_n := d(x_n) \to 0$ and let $x_n' \in \Gamma$ such that $d(x_n) = |x_n - x_n'|$. Using the notations of Subsection 3.1, consider the blowup sequence

$$u_{i,n}(x) := \frac{u_i(x_n' + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_n', (u,v), t_n)}}, \qquad x \in \Omega_n = \frac{\Omega - x_n'}{t_n}$$

which (by Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.16) converges, without loss of generality, to $\bar{u}_i = \gamma_i x_N^+$, with $\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i^2 > 0$. Define $\rho_n(x) := \left(\sum_{i=1}^k u_{i,n}^2\right)^{1/2}$, and $\bar{\rho}(x) := \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \bar{u}_i^2\right)^{1/2} = x_N^+ \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i^2\right)^{1/2}$ and observe that

$$\frac{|\nabla\rho(x_n)|^2 d^2(x_n)}{\rho^2(x_n)} = \frac{|\nabla\rho_n(\frac{x_n - x_n'}{t_n})|^2}{\rho_n^2(\frac{x_n - x_n'}{t_n})}$$

Now $\mathrm{dist}(\frac{x_n - x_n'}{t_n}, \Gamma_{(u_n,v_n)}) = 1$ and $\frac{x_n - x_n'}{t_n} \to \bar{x} \in \partial B_1(0)$; since the convergence $u_{i,n} \to \bar{u}_i$ is $C^{1,\alpha}$ away from a strip around $\Gamma_{(\bar{u},\bar{v})}$ (which is a hyperplane), then we have

$$\frac{|\nabla\rho_n(\frac{x_n - x_n'}{t_n})|^2}{\rho_n^2(\frac{x_n - x_n'}{t_n})} \to \frac{|\nabla\bar{\rho}(\bar{x})|^2}{\bar{\rho}^2(\bar{x})} = \frac{1}{\bar{x}_N^+} \in]0, +\infty[,$$

which is a contradiction.

(ii) Using the same kind of argument as before, one can check that there exists $C > 0$ such that, for $x \sim x_0$,

$$C^{-1} \leqslant \frac{\rho(x)}{\sqrt{H(x', (u,v), d(x))}} \leqslant C.$$

There exists $R_0 > 0$ such that $N(x', (u,v), 0^+) = 1$ for $x' \in B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Gamma$. Then there exists $\bar{r} > 0$ and a small $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that for $r \leqslant \bar{r}$

$$N(x', (u,v), r) \leqslant 1 + \varepsilon' \qquad x' \in B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Gamma_{(u,v)}.$$

Thus we deduce from Theorem 2.21 that, for some $C > 0$,

$$C \leqslant \frac{H(x', (u,v), r)}{r^{2(1+\varepsilon')}}.$$

and, as $x \to x_0$, we have, by choosing $\varepsilon < 2$ so that $2/(2-\varepsilon) > 1 + \varepsilon'$,

$$\frac{\rho(x)^{2-\varepsilon}}{d^2(x)} = \frac{\rho(x)^{2-\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{H(x', (u,v), d(x))}^{2-\varepsilon}} \left[\frac{\sqrt{H(x', (u,v), d(x))}}{d(x)^{2/(2-\varepsilon)}}\right]^{2-\varepsilon} \to +\infty$$

□

Lemma A.9. *Given $x_0 \in \Gamma$, there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that*

$$-\Delta(g \circ \rho) \leqslant 0, \quad g \circ \rho > 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega_1 \cap B_{R_0}(x_0)$$

Proof. This is now a simple consequence of the previous lemma together with (A.2). □

Suppose that $u_1 > 0$ in $B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$ for small $R_0 > 0$. Our aim is to check that u_1 survives for any type of blowup; for that, we will compare it with ρ. For sufficiently small $r > 0$, define $\tilde{g}_r$ as the λ_1/a_1–harmonic extension of $g \circ \rho$ in $B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$, namely

$$-\Delta\tilde{g}_r = \frac{\lambda_1}{a_1}\tilde{g}_r \text{ in } B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1, \qquad \tilde{g}_r = g \circ \rho \geqslant 0 \text{ on } \partial(B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1).$$

By the comparison principle, for $r > 0$ small,

$$\rho \leqslant g \circ \rho \leqslant \tilde{g}_r \qquad \text{in } B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1.$$

Lemma A.10. *Suppose that $u_1 > 0$ in $B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$. Then there exists $C_1 > 0$ (eventually depending on R_0) such that*

$$u_1(x) \geqslant C_1 \rho(x) \qquad \forall x \in B_{R_0/2}(x_0) \cap \overline{\Omega}_1. \tag{A.3}$$

In particular, the first component u_1 survives for any blowup sequence at x_0, i.e., $\bar{u}_1 \not\equiv 0$ whenever $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{BU}_{x_0}$.

Proof. Both u_1 and $\tilde{g}_r$ are positive in $B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$. Thus, by Lemma A.2, we have that, fixing any $y \in B_{R_0/2}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$,

$$C_1 := C^{-1} \frac{u_1(y)}{\rho_r(y)} \leqslant \frac{u_1(x)}{\rho(x)} \qquad \forall x \in B_{R_0/2(x_0)} \cap \overline{\Omega}_1,$$

which wields (A.3). As for the last statement, taking $x_n \to x_0$ and $t_n \to 0$, we have, for all $x \in B_1(0)$ and large n,

$$x_n + t_n x \in B_{R_0/2}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1.$$

Thus

$$u_{1,n} := \frac{u_1(x_n + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_n, (u,v), t_n)}} \geqslant C_1 \frac{\rho_n(x_n + t_n x)}{\sqrt{H(x_n, (u,v), t_n)}},$$

and $u_{1,n} \not\to 0$, as claimed. □

After all this, we are now ready to deform u_1 (or, in general, any component which does not vanish after a blowup). In fact, by using the fact (provided by the previous result) that u_1 does not vanish for any blowup at x_0, we can repeat the proofs of Lemmas A.8 with u_1 in the place of ρ and get the properties stated there for this function, namely:

$$C^{-1} \leqslant \frac{|\nabla u_1(x)|^2 d^2(x)}{u_1^2(x)} \leqslant C, \qquad \text{for } x \in B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1,$$

and

$$\lim_{x \to x_0} \frac{u_1^{2-\varepsilon}}{d^2(x)} = +\infty.$$

This allows us to repeat the proof of Lemma A.9, and hence we can deform u_1 in a subharmonic positive function.

Lemma A.11. *Suppose that $u_1 > 0$ in $B_{R_0}(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$. Then for a sufficiently small $r > 0$, we have*

$$-\Delta(g \circ u_1) \leqslant 0, \quad g \circ u_1 > 0 \qquad \text{in } B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1.$$

Now take the function $h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$h(s) = s - \frac{s^{3-\varepsilon}}{(3-\varepsilon)(2-\varepsilon)}$$

and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(h \circ u_1) &= -\mathrm{div}(h'(u_1)\nabla u_1) = -h'(u_1)\Delta u_1 - h''(u_1)|\nabla u_1|^2 \leqslant \lambda_1 h'(u_1) u_1 - h''(u_1)|\nabla u_1|^2 \\ &= u_1 \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{a_1} + \frac{|\nabla u_1|^2 d^2(x)}{u_1^2} \frac{u_1^{2-\varepsilon}}{d^2(x)} - \frac{\lambda_1}{a_1(2-\varepsilon)} u_1^{2-\varepsilon} \right) \geqslant \frac{\lambda_1}{a_1} u_1 \end{aligned}$$

in $B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega$, for sufficiently small $r > 0$.

Let $\bar{u}_r$ and $\tilde{u}_r$ the λ_i/a_i–harmonic extensions in $B_r(x_0) \cap \Omega_1$ of $g \circ u_1$ and $h \circ u_1$ respectively. By the comparison principle, one has

$$u_1 \leqslant g \circ u_1 \leqslant \bar{u}_r, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_r \leqslant h \circ u_1 \leqslant u_1.$$

Moreover, on $\partial(B_r(x_0)\cap\Omega)$, one has (by using the fact that u_1 is Lipschitz continuous)

$$g\circ u_1 = h\circ u_1\left[1+\frac{\frac{2u_1^{2-\varepsilon}}{(3-\varepsilon)(2-\varepsilon)}}{1-\frac{u_1^{2-\varepsilon}}{(3-\varepsilon)(2-\varepsilon)}}\right]\leqslant h\circ u_1(1+Cr^{2-\varepsilon}).$$

Thus, for $C>0$ independent of $r>0$,

$$\bar u_r\leqslant\tilde u_r(1+Cr^{2-\varepsilon}),\quad\text{hence}\quad u_1\leqslant\bar u_r\leqslant\tilde u_r(1+Cr^{2-\varepsilon})\leqslant u_1(1+Cr^{2-\varepsilon}),$$

and in particular

$$1\leqslant\frac{\bar u_r}{u_1}\leqslant(1+Cr^{2-\varepsilon})\quad\text{ in } B_r(x_0)\cap\Omega_1.$$

Lemma A.12. *Under the previous notations, there exist $0<\delta<<1$, $0<\alpha<1$, $C>0$, such that*

$$\left|\frac{u_i(x)}{\bar u_r(x)}-\frac{u_i(y)}{\bar u_r(y)}\right|\leqslant Cr^{(1-\delta)\alpha/\delta},\qquad\forall x,y\in\overline{\Omega\cap B_{r^{1/\delta}}(x_0)}.$$

Proof. Take w_r and z_r respectively the λ_i/a_i–extensions of u_i^+ and u_i^- in $\Omega_1\cap B_{2r}(x_0)$, namely

$$-\Delta w_r=\frac{\lambda_i}{a_i}w_r,\quad -\Delta z_r=\frac{\lambda_i}{a_i}z_r\qquad\text{in }\Omega_1\cap B_{2r}(x_0)$$

with

$$w_r=u_i^+,\quad z_r=u_i^-\qquad\text{on }\partial(\Omega_1\cap B_{2r}(x_0)).$$

By applying Lemma A.3 to the quotients $w_r/\bar u_r$ and $z_r/\bar u_r$, we deduce the existence of $C>0$ (independent of r) such that

$$\left|\frac{u_i(x)}{u_r(x)}-\frac{u_i(y)}{u_r(y)}\right|\leqslant C\frac{w_r(\xi)+z_r(\xi)}{\bar u_r(\xi)}\frac{|x-y|^\alpha}{r^\alpha},\qquad\forall x,y\in\overline{\Omega\cap B_r(x_0)},\ z\in\Omega\cap B_r(x_0).$$

Reasoning as before, by choosing $\xi=\xi_r\in\partial B_{r/2}(x_0)\cap\Omega$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\xi,\partial\Omega)\geqslant r\varepsilon$ (which exists since Ω is Reifenberg flat) one proves that the quotient $\frac{w_r(\xi)+z_r(\xi)}{\bar u_r(\xi)}$ is bounded. Take $\delta>0$ small; then we conclude that

$$\left|\frac{u_i(x)}{u_r(x)}-\frac{u_i(y)}{u_r(y)}\right|\leqslant C'\frac{|x-y|^\alpha}{r^\alpha}\leqslant C'\frac{r^{\alpha/\delta}}{r^\alpha}=C'r^{(1-\delta)\alpha/\delta},\qquad\forall x,y\in\overline{\Omega\cap B_{r^{1/\delta}}(x_0)},$$

□

Proof of Proposition A.7. We will use the decomposition

$$\frac{u_i}{u_1}=\frac{u_i}{u_r}\frac{u_r}{u_1},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{u_i(x)}{u_1(x)}-\frac{u_i(x_0)}{u_1(x_0)}\right|&\leqslant\left|\frac{u_i(x)}{u_r(x)}-\frac{u_i(x_0)}{u_r(x_0)}\right|\left|\frac{u_r(x)}{u_1(x)}\right|+\left|\frac{u_r(x)}{u_1(x)}-\frac{u_r(x_0)}{u_1(x_0)}\right|\left|\frac{u_i(x_0)}{u_r(x_0)}\right|\\&\leqslant C'r^{(1+\delta)\alpha/\delta}(1+Cr^{2-\varepsilon})+C''r^{2-\varepsilon}\leqslant\kappa r^{(1-\delta)\alpha/\delta}\end{aligned}$$

for every $x\in\overline{\Omega\cap B_{r^{1/\delta}}(x_0)}$, and the result follows. □

References

[1] Ram Band, Gregory Berkolaiko, Hillel Raz, and Uzy Smilansky. The number of nodal domains on quantum graphs as a stability index of graph partitions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 311(3):815–838, 2012.

[2] Henri Berestycki, Susanna Terracini, Kelei Wang, and Juncheng Wei. On entire solutions of an elliptic system modeling phase separations. *Adv. Math.*, 243:102–126, 2013.

[3] Gregory Berkolaiko, Peter Kuchment, and Uzy Smilansky. Critical partitions and nodal deficiency of billiard eigenfunctions. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(6):1517–1540, 2012.

[4] Virginie Bonnaillie-Noël, Bernard Helffer, and Gregory Vial. Numerical simulations for nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 16(1):221–246, 2010.

[5] Blaise Bourdin, Dorin Bucur, and Édouard Oudet. Optimal partitions for eigenvalues. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 31(6):4100–4114, 2009/10.

[6] Dorin Bucur and Giuseppe Buttazzo. *Variational methods in shape optimization problems*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 65. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2005.

[7] Dorin Bucur, Giuseppe Buttazzo, and Antoine Henrot. Existence results for some optimal partition problems. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 8(2):571–579, 1998.

[8] Giuseppe Buttazzo and Gianni Dal Maso. Shape optimization for Dirichlet problems: relaxed formulation and optimality conditions. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 23(1):17–49, 1991.

[9] Giuseppe Buttazzo and Claudia Timofte. On the relaxation of some optimal partition problems. *Adv. Math. Sci. Appl.*, 12(2):509–520, 2002.

[10] L. A. Caffarelli, A. L. Karakhanyan, and Fang-Hua Lin. The geometry of solutions to a segregation problem for nondivergence systems. *J. Fixed Point Theory Appl.*, 5(2):319–351, 2009.

[11] L. A. Caffarelli and Fang Hua Lin. An optimal partition problem for eigenvalues. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 31(1-2):5–18, 2007.

[12] L. A. Caffarelli and Fang-Hua Lin. Singularly perturbed elliptic systems and multi-valued harmonic functions with free boundaries. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(3):847–862, 2008.

[13] Shu-Ming Chang, Chang-Shou Lin, Tai-Chia Lin, and Wen-Wei Lin. Segregated nodal domains of two-dimensional multispecies Bose-Einstein condensates. *Phys. D*, 196(3-4):341–361, 2004.

[14] M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini. Nehari's problem and competing species systems. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 19(6):871–888, 2002.

[15] M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini. An optimal partition problem related to nonlinear eigenvalues. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 198(1):160–196, 2003.

[16] Monica Conti, Susanna Terracini, and Gianmaria Verzini. On a class of optimal partition problems related to the Fučík spectrum and to the monotonicity formulae. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 22(1):45–72, 2005.

[17] E. N. Dancer, Kelei Wang, and Zhitao Zhang. The limit equation for the Gross-Pitaevskii equations and S. Terracini's conjecture. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 262(3):1087–1131, 2012.

[18] Lawrence C. Evans and Ronald F. Gariepy. *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992.

[19] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1983.

[20] B. Helffer. On spectral minimal partitions: a survey. *Milan J. Math.*, 78(2):575–590, 2010.

[21] B. Helffer, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, and S. Terracini. Nodal domains and spectral minimal partitions. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26(1):101–138, 2009.

[22] Bernard Helffer, Thomas Hoffmann-Ostenhof, and Susanna Terracini. Nodal minimal partitions in dimension 3. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 28(2):617–635, 2010.

[23] Bernard Helffer, Thomas Hoffmann-Ostenhof, and Susanna Terracini. On spectral minimal partitions: the case of the sphere. In *Around the research of Vladimir Maz'ya. III*, volume 13 of *Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.)*, pages 153–178. Springer, New York, 2010.

[24] Guanghao Hong and Lihe Wang. A geometric approach to the topological disk theorem of Reifenberg. *Pacific J. Math.*, 233(2):321–339, 2007.

[25] David S. Jerison and Carlos E. Kenig. Boundary behavior of harmonic functions in nontangentially accessible domains. *Adv. in Math.*, 46(1):80–147, 1982.

[26] Carlos E. Kenig. *Harmonic analysis techniques for second order elliptic boundary value problems*, volume 83 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 1994.

[27] Carlos E. Kenig and Tatiana Toro. Harmonic measure on locally flat domains. *Duke Math. J.*, 87(3):509–551, 1997.
[28] J. Lewis. Applications of boundary Harnack inequalities for p harmonic functions and related topics. In *Regularity estimates for nonlinear elliptic and parabolic problems*, volume 2045 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–72. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
[29] Benedetta Noris, Hugo Tavares, Susanna Terracini, and Gianmaria Verzini. Uniform Hölder bounds for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with strong competition. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 63(3):267–302, 2010.
[30] P. Poláčik. Positivity and symmetry of nonnegative solutions of semilinear elliptic equations on planar domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 262(10):4458–4474, 2012.
[31] V. Šverák. On optimal shape design. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 72(6):537–551, 1993.
[32] Hugo Tavares. *Nonlinear elliptic systems with a variational structure: existence, asymptotics and other qualitative properties*. PhD thesis, University of Lisbon, 2010. Available online at http://repositorio.ul.pt/bitstream/10451/2246/1/ulsd059322_td_Hugo_Tavares.pdf.
[33] Hugo Tavares and Susanna Terracini. Regularity of the nodal set of segregated critical configurations under a weak reflection law. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 45(3-4):273–317, 2012.
[34] Hugo Tavares and Susanna Terracini. Sign-changing solutions of competition-diffusion elliptic systems and optimal partition problems. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 29(2):279–300, 2012.
[35] Michel Willem. *Principes d'analyse fonctionnelle*. Nouvelle Bibliothèque Mathématique [New Mathematics Library], 9. Cassini, Paris, 2007.

Hugo Tavares
CAMGSD, Instituto Superior Técnico
Pavilhão de Matemática, Av. Rovisco Pais
1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal
E-mail address: htavares@math.ist.utl.pt

Susanna Terracini
Dipartimento di Matematica "Giuseppe Peano", Università di Torino
Via Carlo Alberto 10,
20123 Torino, Italy
E-mail address: susanna.terracini@unito.it